

Justification Justified:
OR THE GREAT
DOCTRINE
OF
Justification,
Stated according to the
HOLY SCRIPTURES,
And the Judgment of
PROTESTANT DIVINES.

By which several Fundamental Truths, always owned by the Church of *England*, since the Reformation, are Explain'd Confirm'd, and Vindicated from the Errors of

Mr. William Sberlock.

Also a Discourse in Answer to him concerning

ACQUAINTANCE
WITH THE
PERSON of CHRIST.

By *SAMUEL ROLLS.*

London, Printed for the Author, and are to be Sold by
Ben. Billingsley at the Printing-Prefs in *Corn-hill*. 1674.

THE
OF
THE

THE
THE

Mr. William Sherbock

ACQUAINTANCE

REPORT OF



THESES

Of Justification.

I.



THE word *Justification* is taken either *Actively*, for the Act of God who justifieth (or the Act of God in justifying) or *Passively*, for the privilege (or as it is a privilege) of such who are Justified.

II.

The *Active*, and *Passive* Justification, or *Justification* Actively, and Passively taken, are not two things, or two distinct *species*, or kinds of Justification, but one, and the same, diversly considered, or under distinct respects, and habitudes. As the love wherewith I love another man, and the love wherewith he is belov'd of me, are one and the same, but may be considered either as in me, as the *Subject* of that love, or as terminated upon him as the *Object*.

B

III.

III.

Though *Active* and *Passive* Justification do admit of a distinct consideration, yet they can never be really separated, or apart, or one without the other. For God can never be said to justify, but when some body is justified by him, for every Action must have an Object, and every Agent, a Patient. Therefore that justification from Eternity which some speak of, is only God's Decree to justify such and such in time, *viz.* when they should come to believe in Christ, *Gal. 3. 8.* *And the Scripture fore-seeing that God would justify the Gentiles through Faith.*

Yet notwithstanding Justification *Active* and *Passive* are the same thing (only considered the first as coming from God, and the latter as received or applied by the Believer) neither can they be separated, yet this distinction hath it's use. For when we say Faith is an Instrument of our *Justification* it is not as Justification is *Actively* considered; for how can any Action of Man be an Instrument to God's Action? But as we are *Passively* justified we are *justified by believing*; it's not our faith that doth produce our Justification properly; Therefore when it is said, that only *Faith justifieth*, it is to be resolved *Passively*. By Faith only we are justified.

IV.

The proper definition of Justification is such
as

(3)

as doth take in both that which we call *Active*, and that which we call *Passive*: I say, both the *Active*, and *Passive*, Justification (as they are called) are involved, or included, in the usual definition of Justification, which shews that they are really the same thing, though there be some notional difference betwixt them.

V.

Justification (to give you the definition of it) is a gracious Act, or Sentence of God, whereby every true Believer is acquitted, discharged, and absolved, of, and from his sins, and is accounted, declared, and pronounced just, and righteous only for the Righteousness, or Obedience of Christ imputed to him, and received by Faith alone. *Vide Ames. p. 115. Sect. 6. Rom. 3. 22. 24.*

VI.

The fore-said Definition cannot be much, (if at all) amiss, for that it taketh in all, or almost all the causes of Justification, both *Actively*, and *Passively* considered.

VII.

For first, it assigneth the *Efficient* cause of *Justification*, namely, God. For he it is who justifieth, *Rom. 4. 5.* I have therefore call'd it an Act of God. Moreover, to shew what manner of Act, in, or of God the justifying of a sinner is, I call it a *Sentence* of God, the Supreme Judge, thereby intimating it is a *forin-*

sick, or *Court-Act*, an Act of Law, or Judicature (as when a Judge acquitteth a Man that hath satisfied the Law by himself, or Proxy, and dischargeth him by Proclamation, &c.) not a *Physical* Act, as when a Phyfitian by proper Remedies maketh a sick man well, nor yet a *moral* Act, as when a Father by good Counsel, and Example is Instrumental to make a bad Son to become good. For the Act of a Judge when he acquitteth an accused Man is of a distinct Nature from both of these. To *justifie* is no where either in the Old, or New Testament, taken in any other than a *forinsick* sense, *Deut.* 25. 1. *1 King.* 8. 32. *2 Chron.* 6. 23. *Job.* 9. 20. *Prov.* 17. 15. *Isa.* 50. 8. *Mat.* 12. 37. *Rom.* 2. 13. Compared with 12, and 3, 16. & 8. 32, 33. So *Rom.* 6. 7. it signifies to be delivered a *pena*, as one that is acquitted at Law. So the *Temple* was justified, when freed from the Infamy which it was laid under by reason of the Image of *Jupiter Olympius* set up there by *Antiochus*, *Dan.* 8. 14. See also *Job* 9. v. 23. 20. *Psal.* 143. 2. *Isa.* 53. 11. *Luke* 8. 14. *Acts* 13. 39. *1 Cor.* 4. 4. 6. 11. *Titus* 3. 7. Also *Dan.* 12. 3. when Men are said to *justifie* it may be understood in this sense of men as *Instrumental*. Also that in *Rev.* 22. 11. ὁ δίκαιος δικαιοσύνην ποιεῖ, may be thus understood, Let him that is justified continue to apply the Righteousness of Christ to himself by Faith, in order to his being more and more Actually justified from his new sins, &c.

VIII.

The fore-said Definition containeth the *Cau-*

sa Proegoumena of *Justification*, or that whereby God was inwardly (or from within) moved, and excited to justify Believers in such a way and manner as hath been expressed, viz. the *Free Grace*, Mercy, and good will of God towards them. Therefore I have called it a gracious Act of God, or an Act of God's free-Grace. But by the way observe, that the Justifying of a Sinner it's being an Act of *Free-Grace* do's not hinder but it may be an Act of *Justice* too, as it is, all things considered, particularly considering the *Satisfaction* given by Christ. If we respect the Notation or Original of the word *justify*, it should signifie to *make just*, as *Sanctifie* to *make Holy*. But if we regard the common use of it, it no more so imports than as *Sanctifie* used of God imports to *make holy* or *magnifie* in common use of speech to *make great*. And it is the ordinary use of words not their *Original* without it, that must carry it, and determine what they do import, and how they are to be understood. Excellent Mr. Gataker in his Treatise of *Justification*, p. 8. saith, of *Dan. 12. 3* *Rev. 22. 11*. *These I conceive are the only two places in Scripture where the term of justifying or those answering it are thus used, viz. To make a man inherently, or habitually just by a good quality infused, or wrought into him. And yet even those two places may admit of the same Construction of the word Justify, as hath been given of all the rest, vid. Thes. 7.*

That the Free Grace of God was that which from within did move him to justify a sinner is

clearly held forth, *Rom. 3. 24. Being justified freely by his Grace. And Eph. 2. 8. For by Grace are ye saved through Faith. And Titus 3. 7.*

I X.

Justification is rightly called an Act of God's *Free Grace*, and *Mercy* (or a gracious Act of God) (though there be full Satisfaction in the case) upon several accounts. As namely, 1. Because God accepteth of the obedience of one for another, of Christ for us, which he might have chosen whether he would have done, for he might have insisted upon Satisfaction from the Person offending. God might have said, that *The very Soul which hath sinned it shall dye*. Doubtless the Superiors of *Zalencus* (had he had any) might have chosen whether they would have accepted of one of his Eyes, instead of one of his Sons, who had forfeited both. 2. God in strictness of Justice might have required the *idem*, the self-same satisfaction which the Law required, or *penalty* which the Law threatned, *viz.* the eternal destruction of Sinners: but he has been pleased to accept of the *tantundem*, or *tantamount*, from Christ, which is as if a Man were bound to pay me 1000 *l.* in Lawful money of *England*, and I should accept of a *Jewel*, one, or more, to that value, instead thereof, which every body knows I was not bound to do, or might refuse. But 3. It was yet a far greater Act of Grace than either of the former, for God to provide, and procure a Surety, and a Satisfaction, at his own Cost, and Charges (as

Zalen-

Zaleucus redcemed one of his Son's forfeited Eyes with one of his own.) For God not only to find out a *ransom*, and Christ to give himself to be that, and the Holy Ghost, who was Essentially one with the Father and Son, to consent thereunto (for this was done by joynt consent of all the three Persons, who said in effect, Let us redeem Man, as let us make Man) was an Act of infinite Grace, and Mercy. 4. For God to pitch upon Man as an object of justifying Love, and to Elect him thereunto from Eternity, whilst the fallen Angels were passed by, was an Act of meer Free Grace.

X.

The *Final* causes of our *Justification*, or of God's justifying us, were as follow, *viz.* the satisfying of the Love, and Grace of God in saving of Believers, for it is a Satisfaction to Love to do good to those that are beloved of us. So 'tis said of Christ, that *he shall see of the travel of his Soul and shall be satisfied*, and of God, that *Mercy pleaseth him, and therein doth he delight*. I say, the giving content and satisfaction to Divine Love, in, and by the Salvation of Sinners; as also to magnifie, and glorifie the Riches of God's Grace, and Mercy, thereby, are the two great ends, or *Final Causes* of Justification, or of God's justifying us (which may after a sort be reduced to the *Prooxygenal* cause, as being causes inwardly moving God thereunto.)

XI.

The *Final Causes* of *Justification*, *Passively* taken, or of our being justified, are (besides those fore-mentioned) that we should be to the praise of the glory of God's grace, in justifying us, by glorifying him by a holy conversation, *that being delivered out of the hands of our Enemies, we should serve God in Righteousness and Holyness all our dayes*, Luke 1. 74, 75. *Who gave himself for us that he might redeem us from all Iniquity, and might purifie to himself a peculiar People zealous of good works*, Titus 2. 14. This last is the only cause of Justification that hath not been exprest in the definition thereof.

XII.

The definition of Justification which we have given, containeth also the *Material Cause* thereof, *viz.* the Righteousness, or Obedience of Christ: which may otherwise be called the *meritorious cause*, or the *Procatartical*, or external moving cause thereof. For when a *material cause* is assigned of things that are immaterial, or spiritual, the word *matter*, or material, must needs be taken in a *moral*, or *spiritual* sense, and not in a strict sense, for *matter* properly so called.

So that there is no incongruity in terming the *meritorious cause* the *material cause* of our Justification, or the *Procatartical*, or procuring cause thereof, or *vice versa*. The material cause of a thing (say Logicians) is, *ex qua res est*, or that out of which, or of which, or by which
any

any thing is. Now, the Obedience of Jesus Christ, is that out of which our Righteousness before God doth spring, or result, or by, and for which, we are justified, or, which was the only thing from without (*ab extra*) primarily moving God to justify us.

But according to Mr. Sh. our sincere obedience to the Gospel is the matter of our Righteousness before God, or that by which we are justified.

XIII.

Many several Persons, and things are said to *justify*, in different wayes, and respects, *ex gr.*

1. God justifies as a *Judge* by his definitive Sentence, and so Christ who is the Judge of the World, will justify all the Elect in that great day of distinction.
2. Christ justifies more ways than one, *viz.* 1. By his *Blood*, as the price of our justification, *Rom. 5. 9. 18, 19. Acts 13. 39.* 2. Christ justifieth as an *Advocate*, *1 John 2. 1, 2.* alledging his own Obedience in our stead for our justification. 3. The *Law* is said to justify, because it is the *Rule* by which the Judge proceeds in justification, *John 7. 51.* 4. *Witnesses* are said to justify, when their evidence helps to clear the party accused. In that sense Conscience is said to excuse, or justify, *1 John 3. 20, 21.* 5. Whatsoever is pleaded as a sufficient ground, or motive, for which a Man may be cleared from the fault objected against him is said to *justify*. So *works* justify, *Jam. 2. 22. 24.* And *words*, *Mat. 12. 37.* as *evidences* that are
pro-

produced to manifest innocency, or integrity. 6. That which is a means to make a man partaker of Christs Righteousness is also said to *justify*; so *Faith* justifies, &c. But when the question is put whereby, or by what a sinner is justified in the sight of God? it is usually intended of the *formal cause* of our *Justification*; as if it had been put in these words, How comes it to pass that Believers are righteous in Gods account, as if they had (which they have not) a perfect Righteousness formally inherent in themselves? or whence is it that Believers are by God discharg'd from Hell, and accepted Righteous to eternal life, as if they were *formally* Righteous by a perfect Righteousness of their own? To which the Answer is, It is by means of the Righteousness of Christ imputed to them, and by means of that imputation, made as beneficial to them, as if it were formally inherent in them. Now the Definition given doth also contain the *formal cause* of our Justification, *viz.* the imputation of Christs Righteousness, or Obedience to us. For as a man is a man by being indued with a reasonable soul; (or that is the *form*, or *formalis ratio* of a man) so a Believer is justified by vertue of having the Righteousness of Christ imputed to him, or being invested with that Righteousness. But now according to Mr. Sh. the acceptance of our sincere Obedience to the Gospel is the *formal cause* of our Justification, or that by vertue whereof we become Justified.

XIV.

When we call the Imputation of Christ his Righteousness, or Obedience, the *Formal Cause* of Justification; we do not take the word *Form*, or *Formal* cause strictly, and Physically, as they do who thus define it, *viz. Forma est interna causa per quam res est id quod est*. For the Righteousness of Christ is not internal, nor inherent, in justified persons; but external, foreign, and imputed; (though as to Justification it self, it is intrinsecal, and so is the imputing of it) but our meaning is this, that the manner of Gods justifying a sinner, is by imputing to him the Righteousness of Jesus Christ. A man doth not become justified, or is not constituted just by the Righteousness of Christ inhering in him, or dwelling in him, as the soul doth in the body; but the Righteousness of Christ doth *Ingredi Justificationem*, though not *Justificatum*; i. e. entereth into the definition of *Justification*, though not into the Person Justified.

XV.

When we say that God imputeth Christ's Righteousness to us, our meaning is nothing else but this; that he graciously accepts for us, and in our behalf the Righteousness of Christ, as if we had in our own persons, satisfied his Law. Bishop Davenant saith, p. 359. *de Justitia Actuali*, &c. *Imputare alicui idem est in hac questione, atque inter ea quæ sunt ipsius, & ad eum pertinent, illud connumerare, & recensere.*

Also

Also B. Davenant, p. 313. *Quando formalem causam querimus Justitie nostrae, id querimus propter quod peccator in gratiam Dei recipitur, per quod immediate Deo gratus, & ad vitam eternam acceptus stat, cujus beneficio damnatoriam legis sententiam evadere, denique quoniti possit ac debeat ad Coelestis judicis favorem & approbationem consequendam.*

XVI.

The word *Forme*, or *Formes*, is usually applied not only to *substantial* *Formes*, which do give *esse simpliciter*, but also to *accidental* *Forms*, which do give *esse tale*: so we say *learning* is the *form* by which a man is *learned*, and *heat* the *form* by which the fire is *hot*. So here, the *form* of *Justification*, is that by which a justified man is not only reputed, and denominated such before God, but is so made, and constituted. Now because by a passive denomination a man is said to be justified; it is not necessary that this denomination be taken from an inherent form, or should suppose an inherent form. *Ex gr.* when we say that a man is beloved, honored, condemned, or acquitted, all these things may be said of him in whom there is no inherent form, which may found, or be the foundation of these denominations. *Vasquez* saith, *Potest aliquid dici justum extrinseca & aliena justitia.*

N. B. But yet the name *Just*, is not in Scripture so usually taken from an extrinseck form, as is the name *Justified*; for men are called Righteous, or holy in Scripture, from an inherent
Right-

Righteousness, begun in them, but *justified* only from the most perfect Righteousness of Christ imputed to them.

If therefore the name of a justified person, and the benefit of Justification, be not had by any form inherent in us, but by a respect had to something that is extrinsical, it is manifest that we are justified by way of *Imputation*, and that that extrinsick Righteousness, though it be not a Physical form within us; yet doth supply the room of such a thing, and in that sense is rightly called the *formal cause* of Justification. *Vide Davenant, p. 346. Per formalem causam justificationis nihil aliud intelligimus quam illud per quod stamus in conspectu Dei, a damnatione liberari, innocentes, gratificari, & ad vitam eternam acceptati, &c.*

XVII.

That the Imputed Righteousness of Christ is the *Formal cause* of Justification, B. *Davenant* sheweth by the following Arguments, p. 362.

XVIII.

The benefit of Christ's imputed Righteousness doth not consist in this, that thereby we are indowed with an inherent Righteousness which may abide the strict judgment of God; but that apprehending Christ by Faith, with respect to his Merits, we may be absolved from the condemning power of the Law, and accepted to life eternal. *Ergo*, For this he quotes *Joh. 3. 16.* and

18. & *Joh. 5. 24.* *He that believeth on him that sent me shall not come into Judgment (or Condemnation, &c.* Here, saith he, I query what is the Judgment which they who believe on Christ shall not come into, or are exempted from for Christ's sake? Doubtless, saith he, it is that strict Judgment of God, when a Man is examined according to the Rule of the *Law*, and is pronounced Righteous, or unrighteous, according as he is found exactly to answer, or not to answer thereunto, and is accordingly rewarded, or punished. Therefore the Justification, and Salvation of Believers, depends upon these, that by, and for the merits of Christ, they shall be so dealt with, as if they had a perfect Legal Righteousness in themselves, p. 362, 365.

XIX.

The disobedience of *Adam* is so imputed to his Posterity that with respect to that they stand guilty before God, and condemn'd to eternal punishment: Therefore the Obedience of Christ is so imputed to his Mystical Members, that with respect to that, they stand justified before God, and accepted to Eternal Life. The Consequence he proves from *Rom. 5. 19.* *Bel-larmin* himself, *De Amiff. Gratia. Lib. 5. 17.* saith, *the Disobedience wilfully committed by Adam made his Posterity guilty of Death, and hateful to God, and that that very sin of his was communicated to us by imputation. For it was imputed (saith he) to all that are born of Adam (or that sprang from Adam) because we all being in the loins*
of

of Adam did sin in him, and by him when he sinned. See B. Davenant, p. 363. 364.

X X.

God with respect to the Obedience of Christ, even to the death of the Cross, hath freed us from the punishment due to the transgressors of the *Law*, by imputing to us that Satisfaction of another as if it had been ours. *Ergo*, Bellarmin himself, *De Justit Lib. 2. Cap. 10.* saith, Christ is said to be our Righteousness because he satisfied his Father for us, and doth so communicate that satisfaction to us, when he justifieth us, that it may be called our satisfaction, and righteousness. It would not be absurd (saith he) if one should say that the Righteousness and merits of Christ are imputed to us for that they are given and applyed to us as if we had satisfied God our selves. B. Davenant, p. 364. How much more Orthodox is Bellarmin himself in this last passage (if not in the former also) than Mr. Sh.?

X X I.

Scripture acknowledgeth the Righteousness of Christ to be ours who believe, viz. in, 1 Cor. 1. 30. 2 Cor. 5. 21. & Phil. 3. 9. Now, ours it cannot be otherwise than by *Imputation*. Now the making of that perfect Righteousness ours, wherefore is it but to supply the absence of that perfect Righteousness which ought to be in us, but is not? Therefore the Imputed Righteousness of Christ, doth in Justification supply the place of a *Formal Cause*. B. Davenant, p. 366.

XXII.

XXII.

Again, B. *Davenant* useth this Argument. They who being cloathed with Christ, and his Righteousness are accepted to eternal Life, in them this imputed Righteousness (as to the benefit of Justification,) is in the Nature of a formal Cause. But all Believers are so cloathed with Christ, and his Righteousness, *Gal. 6. 26, 27 Eph. 1. 6. Who hath made us accepted to himself in his beloved.* Therefore our imperfect Righteousness cannot render us accepted with God to Eternal Life, but it behoveth us to appear before him cloathed with the Garment of our Elder Brother, as *Jacob* did when he sought the Blessing. Which Similitude Mr. *Sh.* derideth, yet *Bellarmin* himself saith, *Sano modo similitudinem indumenti Christi accommodari posse justitiæ imputatæ.* B. *Davenant* adds, that we being cloathed with the Righteousness of Christ by God's donation, and the application of Faith, it doth no less conduce to our Justification than it would do if it were *formally* inherent, and in that sense we may call it the *formal Cause* of Justification.

XXIII.

Again, the Bishop aforesaid argueth thus, He who was made a *Surety* for us, and took upon him the payment of our whole Debt, his Obedience is imputed to us, and being imputed availeth as much as if it were inherent in us. But so was Christ, *Heb. 7. 22.* Now to be as
advan-

advantagious, and available to us, as if it were inherent, is (saith he) *supplere vicem cause formalis*. Hence we are said to be compleat in Christ. Dr. *Hammond*, in his Catechism, p. 489. puts this Question, *How was the pardon of sin purchased?* His Answer is, *By the satisfaction wrought by him in his sufferings taking upon him to be our Surety, and to suffer in our stead, that as many as are renewed by his Grace may be released by his sufferings, &c.*

X X I V.

Another Argument of Bp. D. is this.

The Scriptures which do affirm that Faith is imputed to us for Righteousness do plainly shew that the Righteousness of Christ is imputed to Believers; for those Texts must needs be meant of Faith as it apprehendeth it's object, and applyeth Christ and his saving Righteousness to believers. For nothing is more usual than to attribute that to the cause applying which properly and immediately belongs to the thing applied; whereas *Bellarmin* calleth Imputed Righteousness; *Imaginatio Justitie, cui veritas non respondet* (or, with Mr. *Sh.* an imaginary Righteousness;) Bp. D. replyeth, *When God repunes us Righteous by Faith, the Truth answering to this estimation is not the Righteousness of Christ formally inherent in us, but the Righteousness of Christ really participated, and given to us by Divine appointment: God does not think us to be inherently just, but for that imputation he esteems us freed from the damnation of Sin, and accepted to Eternal Life.*

XXV.

The fore-said Excellent Bishop argueth further thus; either the Imputed Righteousness of Christ is the *Formal Cause* of our *Justification*, or it only interveneth to obtain for us some other *Formal Cause* of our *Justification*. But not the latter, saith he, *Ergo* the former.

He goes on to shew how our first *παραλαβή*, or entrance into the favour of God, is by the Righteousness of Christ, apprehended by Faith, *Rom* 8. 5. *Being justified by Faith we have Peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ*. v. 2. *By whom also we have access by Faith into this grace*. Then that our *standing*, or abiding, and continuing in that favour of God, is not by our own Righteousness he proveth from the following words, *wherein we stand*, viz. by the same Faith, and by the same Christ. Yea, further (saith he) our acceptation to Glory is not from inherent Righteousness, but from our Mediator and his Righteousness, for it followeth; *And rejoyce* (viz. by Faith) *in hope of the glory of God*: i. e. by the same Faith we expect glory, by the same Christ.

XXVI.

Another Argument which *B. Davenant* useth, is this; Imputed Righteousness is nothing else but the Righteousness of Christ applyed, and given to us, to produce some Spiritual effect. For when God with respect unto Christ his Righteousness vouchsafeth to deal with us as if
it

it were our own (inherently) then he is said to impute it to us. But Righteousness so applied and given to us, though it be not in us after the manner of a Physical form, yet hath the efficacy of a *Formal Cause* by Divine Ordination and Acceptation. One and the same Righteousness of Christ considered in its self, and its own worth is the *Meritorious cause* of our Justification, but considered as *imputed*, given, and applied as their own to all Believers, supplies the place of a *Formal Cause*.

X X V I I.

The last Argument of the Excellent Bishop afore-said proving the *Imputation* of Christ his Righteousness to be the *Formal Cause* of our Justification, is as followeth.

If there be but one *divine* or Righteousness that can avail to Justification of Life, and that be the Obedience of Christ alone, then certain it is that Justification doth belong to none but those that are partakers of that Righteousness. But this is in plain words Asserted by the Apostle, *Rom. 5. 18. For as by the offence of one judgement came upon all men to condemnation: even so by the Righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men to justification of life. et in eisdem delictis, per unam justitiam exactam.* Therefore the Justification of life doth not redound from any quality inherent in us, but this compleat Righteousness of our Mediator, given, and imputed to us. Our inherent Righteousness hath not (saith he) *divine*, that is, (according to him) a compleat, and

absolute perfection of Righteousness; therefore it cannot produce in us justification of life, which is a most perfect effect of a most perfect cause: Therefore the Righteousness of Christ is to us instead of a *Formal cause* constituting our *Justification*. In *Rom. 5. 18.* where 'tis said, *By the Righteousness of one*, δι' ἑνὸς δικαιοσύνης, the true gift came upon all to the Justification of life διὰ δικαιοσύνην ζωῆς, by the word δικαιοσύνη is meant not *Justification*, the effect, called δίκαιον; but the one only Righteousness of Christ, whereby we are justified. And it seems more proper to translate it *Soby one Righteousness*, δι' ἑνὸς δικαιοσύνης *per unam* rather than *per unius iustitiam*; For the Apostle does not say διὰ δικαιοσύνης τῆς ἑνῆς (as in the next, διὰ τῆς ὑπακοῆς τῆς ἑνῆς) with an article, and the Adjective put after the Substantive. Moreover, to translate it by *one Righteousness*, rather than by the *Righteousness of one* doth better accord and answer to δι' ἑνὸς παρρησιαστικῆς, *Rom. 5. 18.* *As by one offence* (and so it is in our Margin) moreover the word δικαιοσύνη there seems to signifie more than *Justitia*, viz. *Justificamen*, or *Justificamentem* (if we may make such words) or as the *French* translate it, *Justice Justificante*.

XXVIII.

We have put in the word, *only*, into the Definition of *Justification*, that thereby we might exclude all falsely pretended *Material*, and *Formal* causes of our Justification, by saying we are accounted Righteous, *only*, for the Righteousness,

teousness, and Obedience of Christ, &c. to shew, that the Righteousness of Christ is the only *Matter*, and the *Imputation* thereof the only *Forme* of our Justification.

X X I X.

To the Arguments which have been already brought, I would add, If *Inherent Righteousness* be not the *Formal cause* of our Justification, either we may be justified without any Righteousness at all, or we must be justified by *Imputed Righteousness*, as the *Formal cause* of our Justification; But neither can we be justified without any real Righteousness on the one hand, nor yet by vertue of an *Inherent Righteousness* on the other hand: *Ergo*, we must be justified by Righteousness Imputed.

X X X.

Common sense will tell us, that for a man to be, or to be made Righteous, (which is all one with *Justified*, for so are all that are Justified) without any Righteousness of his own inherent, or imputed, is against sense, and reason, as much as to say that a man can be truly rich, and yet neither have any estate of his own, nor the use of any other mans; or be very wise, and yet neither have any head-piece of his own, nor yet the advice and counsel of any other wiser than himself. The judgment of God is according to truth. If God did not make a Believer perfectly Righteous, as to guilt, and condemnation, by vertue of Christ's Obedience imputed

to him, he could not account him so, &c. Philosophers say *Deus ipse non potest supplere defectum cause formalis. ex gr.* God cannot make a man without a reasonable soul, or a wise man without wisdom, &c. For so to do doth *implicare*.

XXXI.

Inherent Righteousness cannot be the *formal cause* of our *Justification*: Therefore *Imputed* must, sith we cannot be justified without a Righteousness, and there are but these two sorts: For all Righteousness is either *Inherent*, or *Imputed*.

XXXII.

To prove that we cannot be justified by *Inherent* Righteousness, or that, that cannot be the *Formal cause* of our *Justification* Bp. D. brings seven following Arguments contained in several Paragraphs, or Sections, one in each &c. p. 346.

XXXIII.

If we are justified by *Inherent* Righteousness, as the *Formal cause*, than either by *Habitual*, or *Actual*, not by *Habitual* (according to the Papists) For many of them do say that it is not *de fide*, but a meer probable thing that there is any such thing as a *habit*, or habits of Grace infused into Believers. And as for *Actual* Righteousness, the *Counsel of TRENT*, denieth that any man is *justified* thereby, *Bellarmin de Justit. lib. 2. cap. 15.* Neither can *Actual* Righteousness be counted *Inherent*, properly, because
it

it consists not in permanent qualities, but in transient acts, which are said to *flow* from the soul, not to *inhere* in it, for they abide no where.

X X X I V.

If we are formally justified by Inherent Righteousness, then it must be by that Inherent perfect Righteousness which is accompanied with Actual Righteousness that is perfect also: but there is no such Inherent Righteousness in this life; and if there were, and he that had it should not perfectly live, and act according to it, he would be so far from being justifi'd thereby, that it would aggravate his Condemnation. *That our Justification must be by a perfect Righteousness, and no otherwise is evident, because the Scripture saith, cursed is he that continueth not in all to do them, Gal 3. 10. Also for that the Apostle having said, By the works of the Law is no flesh justified in Gods sight, which he confirms in the remainder of that, and in the next whole Chapter, viz. Rom. 4. also in Gal. 3. The Arguments which he brings to prove it are such as these, viz. Because we have all sinned, and come short of the glory of God. Because we are justified *duplex*, which implies a deficiency of Merit. Also because they are said to be Blessed whose sins are covered, which implies, that the works of Justified Persons are mixt with sin, and therefore cannot justify them. Also, If Justification were by works, Christ had died in vain, and Faith were vain we were yet under the Curse, &c. All which passages do shew that an imperfect Righteousness cannot justify us,* (for

else they are not conclusive) and a perfect inherent Righteousness we neither have, nor can have in this Life.

Whereas the Papists say, that the works by St. Paul excluded from Justification, are only the works of the *Unregenerate*: that is manifestly false; for in the places quoted, he excludeth from Justification the Works of *Abraham* when Circumcised, Regenerate, and a true Believer, *Rom. 4. Gal. 3.* So *David* acknowledgeth that the works of the Regenerate could not stand before the strict Judgment of God, *Psal. 143. 2.* see *Gal. 2. 15, 16.*

X X X V I.

The *Formal Cause* of Justification ought to have such efficacy, as after sin committed, to compensate, or satisfy for the injury done to the Divine Majesty: But by a Created quality (such as *Inherent Righteousness* is) God cannot be satisfied for the injury done to him. The offence given, and injury done to God by every wilful (or mortal) sin is infinite, as *T. Aquinas* part 3. qu. art. 2. saith, *Peccatum contra Deum Commissum quandem infinitatem habet, infinitate Divinae Majestatis.* That it is so is apparent by Gods threatening infinite punishment for every such sin, and by the common confession of the Schoolmen, &c.

Now 'tis impossible that by a quality of but a finite Virtue and Dignity, an offence of infinite Indignity should be blotted out, or compensated and satisfied for, Bp. D. p. 350.

XXXVI.

If Inherent Righteousness be the Formal cause of Justification; then it expelleth the contrary Forme, *viz.* Inherent Sin, at its first coming, and at the first informing of its subject, This Proposition is not only granted by the Papists, (*Vasquez* and others) but laid as a great Foundation. But Inherent Righteousness cannot do that. Witness *Isa.* 64. 6. *We are all as an unclean thing, and our Righteousness as filthy raggs, &c.* *Job* 9. 30, 31. *Dan.* 9. 7. *Ezek.* 9. 13. All these were indowed with with Inherent Grace, yet they all own themselves to be spotted with sin.

XXXVII.

He that is formally justified by Inherent Righteousness, from the time he hath attained that quality is acceptable to God, and worthy of eternal life by vertue of that quality, without the supervening Grace of God, and Imputation of the Merits of Christ. For according to the Papists, the Formal cause of Justification, from the nature of the thing, doth absolutely make us acceptable to God, and worthy of Heaven. But certain it is, that we do stand accepted with God, and to eternal happiness, not by the efficacy, dignity, and vertue of this infused quality, but by the Merit of the Mediator. For if it be enquired, how we come to be received as the Children of God, the Scripture answereth, by, and for Christ: not by, and for the Sanctity that is bestowed upon us. *Gal.* 4. 4. *God sent his Son*
that

that he might Redeem those that are under the Law, that we might receive the Adoption of Sons. And because ye are Sons he hath sent the spirit of his Son into your hearts. He do's not say Ye are received for Sons, because the Spirit hath imprest Inherent Holiness upon you; but *e contra*. So that *Inherent Holiness* is not the cause of Sonship, but the Consequent. Again, If it be enquired why we are accepted with God to eternal life; the Scripture answereth, not by our *Inherent Righteousness*, but by the favour of God in Christ our Mediator *Rom. 5. 9. Being justified by his blood, we shall be delivered from wrath by him.* Also, *Rom. 6. 32. The Gift of God is Eternal Life by Jesus Christ our Lord.* (not by *Inherent Righteousness*, but by Christ, Bp. D. p. 352, 353.)

XXXVIII.

Christ resigneth to no Creature the proper Works of a *Mediator*: Therefore he doth not confer upon *Inherent Righteousness*, that that should take away our sins, should reconcile us to God, should render us accepted to eternal life, and consequently he hath not made that to be the *Formal cause* of our Justification.

XXXIX.

The Formal cause of Justification ought to be such, as to which a Believer may safely, and boldly commit himself in trouble of Conscience, and in the Agony of Death. But none of the Papists have dared to trust to their own Righteousness, when under serious Temptations, when
Con.

Conscience was struck with a true sense of sin, and of the Wrath of God, and snatcht, as it were, before the Tribunal of God. See B. *Downam* p. 202, 203. By which it appeareth that the Papists themselves, when under the expectations of death, or trouble of Conscience, are more Orthodox, than Mr. *Sh.* now is, in the point of Justification.

X L.

He is not justified by his own Inherent Righteousness who stands justified by that that he receiveth from God daily the pardon of his unrighteousness. But we do all sin daily, and daily ask the forgiveness of sin: Therefore we acknowledge that we do not stand justified, or worthy of Heaven, by a quality of Righteousness *Inherent* in us; but that by the Remission of sins, and favor of God, life eternal is given to us, who are most unworthy, for Christs sake.

X L I.

If the Righteousness of Christ be the *Matter*, or *Material* cause of Justification, then the *Imputation* thereof is the *Form*, or *Formal* cause thereof. But the Righteousness of Christ is the *Matter* of our Justification. By the *Matter* of our Justification, I mean that Righteousness by which we are justified; I say if it be so, then *Imputation*, or the *Imputing* of that Righteousness must be the *Forme*: For it is the way, and manner in which we are justified, or whereby the Righteousness of Christ comes to be as useful to us, for matter of Justification; as if it were

an internal, inherently formal Righteousness, which were in strictness of speaking, that form whereby we were made just, or Righteous. Now that the Righteousness of Christ is the *Material Cause* of our Justification, I prove by the ensuing Arguments

1. The Righteousness whereby we are justified is God's Righteousness, not ours, *Rom. 1. 17. Rom. 3. 21.* The Righteousness of Christ which is out of us in him is God's Righteousness, *2 Cor. 5. 21. 2 Pet. 1. 2.* that which is inherent in us is ours: therefore we are justified by the Righteousness of Christ, which is out of us in him, and not by that which is inherent in our selves. Now in *Rom. 4. 3.* There is such an opposition made betwixt God's Righteousness and ours, in the point of Justification; that whosoever seek to be justified by their own Righteousness, cannot be justified by the Righteousness of God. *Bp. D. p. 127, 128.*

2. That is the *matter* of our Justification before God, by which we being sinners in our selves do stand righteous before God, which we being sinners may oppose to the Judgment of God, why he should not condemn us, which we may plead as a full satisfaction to God for us: such is the Righteousness of Christ. For being sinners in our selves, yet believing in Christ, we are in him accepted, and constituted Righteous, *2 Cor. 5. 21. Rom. 5. 19.*

3. By that Righteousness of man which only is *perfect* we are justified, and not by that which is *imperfect*. The Righteousness of Christ, which is

is out of us in him, is the only Righteousness of man which is *perfect*, and all our inherent Righteousness in this life is *imperfect*. *Ergo*. The Proposition needeth no proof; for that Justice which is not perfect cannot stand in judgment before God, and is so far from justifying, that it self is sinful, every imperfection, and defect, being *avouia*, a transgression of the Law, and consequently a sin. *Augustin* saith, *Peccatum est cum charitas minor est quam debet*.

4. By that Righteousness alone, and by no other we are justified, by which the Law is fully satisfied, and not by any Righteousness inherent in us, or performed by us. Therefore we are justified by the Righteousness of Christ alone, and not by any Righteousness *inherent* in us, or performed by us. Three things are here to be acknowledged. First, That whosoever is justified, is made just by some Righteousness; for to think a man should be justified without justice, is as absurd as to think a man is cloathed without apparel.

Secondly, That all true Righteousness is conformity to the Law of God, which is that perfect Rule of Righteousness.

Thirdly, That there can be no Justification without the Law be satisfied, either by our selves, or by another for us, *Mat. 5. 17. Rom. 3. 31*. Now by the Righteousness of Christ the Law is fully satisfied; but by any other Righteousness inherent in us, or performed by us, the Law neither is, nor can be fully satisfied.

5. By what Righteousness we are *absolved*,
redeem-

redeemed, Reconciled; and for which we shall be *saved*, by it we are justified. But by the Righteousness of Christ alone, we are *absolved* from our sins, *redeemed* from our iniquities, *reconciled* to God, and shall be *saved*. *Ergo*, The Righteousness of Christ is the *matter* of our Righteousness before God, or the only Righteousness by which we are justified. To prove the *Major*, read *Rom.* 4. 5, 6, 7, 8. where *Justification* and *Remission*, or *Absolution* are spoken of promiscuously.

Again the benefit of Redemption is explained by *Remission* of sin, *Eph.* 1. 7. *Col.* 1. 14. *Titus* 2. 14. *Psal.* 133. 8.

Again, Being reconciled to God, and being justified are used promiscuously, *Rom.* 5. 9, 10. *2 Cor.* 5. 14.

Again, Salvation, and Justification, are put one for the other; for that which is the *Matter* of Justification, is the *merit* of Salvation: for by what we are justified, by that we are intitled to Salvation; and by what we receive remission of sins, by that also we receive our Inheritance. Justification may be compared to the *Institution* of a Minister to a Benefice, which giveth *Jus ad rem* Glorification to *Induction*, which giveth *Jus in re*, or possession, &c.

6. The Righteousness of God by which we are justified is not prescribed in the Law to Justification, but without the Law is revealed in the Gospel, *Rom.* 3. 21. Therefore not inherent Righteousness, but that is the matter of our Justification: for the Righteousness of God is
not

not prescribed in the Law to justification, but *Inherent* Righteousness is, this being the great difference betwixt the Law, and the Gospel, that the Law to Justification requireth perfect Obedience to be performed in our own persons: The Gospel propoundeth the Obedience of Christ, which he performed for us to be accepted in their behalf who believe in him. Wherefore (saith Bp. D. p. 200. alluding to *Gal. 1. 8, 9.*) *Let him be held accursed, though he were an Apostle, though an Angel from Heaven, who shall teach justification by the Legal Righteousness, and not by the Evangelical.*

7. The matter of our Righteousness before God, as it is not *only* our Inherent Righteousness, so neither is it that in part: For we are not justified before God, both by Faith and by Works, by Gods Righteousness and our own, by that Righteousness which is out of Christ in us, and that which is inherent in our selves: For the Scripture maketh such an opposition betwixt these two, as that they cannot stand together, *Rom. 3. 28. Rom. 4. 4, 5. 9. 3, 31, 32. 11. 5, 6. Phil. 3. 9. Gal. 2. 16. 3. 11. Eph. 2. 8, 9. Ergo.* The only matter of our Justification is the Righteousness, or Obedience of Christ, *Rom. 5. 9, 19.*

8. An Imputative, not an Inherent righteousness is the matter of our Justification, and therefore the righteousness of Christ is it. For proof of that matter, see *Rom. 5. 19.* where it is called the *Righteousness of one*, whereas if it were a *Righteousness from him in us*, it would be the *Justice of so many as are justified*, as the Council of Trent speaketh,

eth, Justitiam in nobis recipientes unusquisque suam.

9. That Justification which the Scripture teacheth taketh away all manner of boasting, *Rom.* 3. 27. *Eph.* 2. 9. But the owning of Christ his righteousness for the only matter of our Justification, only taketh away boasting. Therefore that is, and ought to be so owned. They that make as if our sincere Obedience were the matter of our Justification, do speak as if the *Covenant of Grace*, and the other of *Works*, did differ only *gradu not Specie* and both did yield matter of boasting, only the *Covenant of Grace*, the less of the two.

10. The Righteousness whereby *Abraham*, *David*, and *Paul*, were justified, was the righteousness of Christ: Therefore that is the only matter of our righteousness before God, or the only righteousness whereby we can be justified, *Rom.* 4. 13, 4, 5, 23, 24. *Psal.* 143. 2. *Psal.* 71. 16. *1 Cor.* 4. 4. *Phil.* 3. 8, 9. To these we might add *Job*, *Esay*, and *Daniel*, *Job* 9. 2, 3. 15. 20. 10. 15. 42. 6. *Isa.* 6. 1, 5. *Dan.* 6. 7, 18.

11. What righteousness God accepteth on our behalf by that we are justified: the righteousness of Christ which he performed for us in his flesh, God accepteth on our behalf. *Ergo*: By that we are Justified, or *that is* the matter of our Justification. *This very Argument* Bellarmin useth against Osiander, *De Justif.* lib. 2. cap. 5. Otherwise (saith he) *Why did the Son of God take our flesh upon him, why became he obedient unto death? &c.*

12. Only a righteousness of infinite value, can be

be a satisfaction for sin (so *Bellarmin* himself saith in the same place) Such is the Righteousness of Christ only in regard of the dignity of his Person, &c. *Ergo*. The Righteousness of Christ only can be the matter of our Righteousness before God.

13. The Scripture speaks of our Righteousness being in Christ, and of our being Righteous in him, or of Christ being our Righteousness. *Ergo*. *Isa.* 45. 24, 25. *2 Cor.* 5. 21. *Phil.* 3. 8, 9. *Jer.* 23. 6. *Jer.* 33. 16. *1 Cor.* 1. 30. These Texts *Bp. Downam* hath for imputed Righteousness; which *Mr. Sherlock* rejects as nothing to that purpose. See *Bp. Downam*, p. 224. *Bellarmin* himself confesseth, that Christ is called our Righteousness, because he satisfied his Father for us, which his Satisfaction he doth so give and communicate to us when he doth justify us that it may be called our Satisfaction and our Righteousness. This Confession dissolveth the very frame of his whole Doctrine of Justification: whereunto he hath taught that nothing concurreth but Deletion of sin, and Infusion of Righteousness, which they say expelleth sin, &c. As for Imputation of Christ's Righteousness, he, and his followers deride and scorn it. But here he confesseth, that in Justification the Satisfaction of Christ is imputed to us and accepted of God in our behalf, as if we our selves had satisfied God, and that for that cause he is truly called our Righteousness. How much more Orthodox is *Bellarmin* here than *Mr. Sherlock*?

14. We are justified by the Blood of Christ;

D

Rom.

Rom. 5. 19. Therefore the Obedience of Christ, even to Death, is the matter of our Justification.

15. By the Righteousness of Christ our sins are covered as by a Garment, *Ergo*. That is the matter of our Justification, *Psal.* 32. 1. For he is justified whose sins are covered. See Bp. Downam, p. 226. saith he, *Bellarmin confesseth that the similitude*, and the Example of *Jacob* may be accommodated to imputed Righteousness, which Similitude Mr. *Sh.* scoffs at, &c.

N. B. *Bellarmin* would perswade the world that we are so absurd, as to teach that we are formally made just by the Righteousness of another; but (saith Bp. Downam) we are well content that the Righteousness whereby we are Sanctified, or formally made Righteous should not be *Imputative*, so that they will confess that the Righteousness of Christ his whole Satisfaction, whereby we are justified before God is imputed to us, which they must confess, or else they cannot be saved, p. 227. Thus far he, &c.

XLII.

Whereas it may be enquired whether the *Active*, or *Passive* Obedience of Christ, or both together, be the matter of our Justification, and the Imputation thereof the *Form*: I Answer, that the *Active*, and *Passive* Obedience of Christ, are both in a sense, and to a degree, imputed to Believers, though not in so large a sense, as some have said, *viz.* as if Believers were reckoned

oned by Christ their Surety to have done whatsoever Christ himself did, viz. to have fulfilled all Righteousness, neither to have committed any thing which they ought not to have done, nor to have omitted any thing which they ought to have done: Or, as if Believers in Christ might have been said to have done whatsoever he did in the Flesh, or Christ to have done every thing that he did in their stead, room, and behalf, and as it were for them.

For whatsoever Jesus Christ was bound, as Man, by the Law of Creation, to do for himself, *Ex. gr.* to love God with all his heart, &c. he could not be said to have done for others (so as he is said to have suffered for us) or Believers to have done, in, and by him: For as Christ could not have made atonement for our sins if he had any sin of his own, *Heb. 7. 27.* *Such a High-Priest became us who needed not daily as those High-Priests to Offer up sacrifice first for his own sin, and then for the People's, &c.* So what Duty and observance Christ had to pay for himself, he could not be said to have presented to God upon our account, or we to have fulfilled these things in him, *Ex. gr.* That we in Christ did love God, trust in God, delight to do the Will of God, or that forasmuch as he did it we may be said to have done it also. That I say is not true. Were that true, that Christ had done every thing that the Law of God requires that Believers should do, or should ever have done; and that upon their account, that they in, and by him might have been reckoned to have

kept the whole Law of God perfectly, and God to have accepted of his Active Obedience, instead of theirs, two things would follow, viz.

1. Then there were no need of the *Passive* Obedience or sufferings of Christ on our behalf, sith believers might plead not guilty to the whole Law of God, upon the account of having completely answered to every tittle thereof, by Christ their Surety, who was appointed of God to Officiate in their stead.

2. Neither then would it be needful for us to keep the Law of God, to our power in our own Persons sith it had been kept, and observed for us by way of proxy, allowed of God for that purpose. To be sure it would be unjust for God to punish us for not observing his Law our selves, so long as it was punctually observed by Christ, whom himself (according to that Opinion) did admit, and allow of, to keep, and observe it upon our account. He who hath his place excellently well Officiated and supplied by an able Proxy, allowed, and admitted to Officiate for him, is no more to be blam'd, or kept from his reward, than if he had serv'd it in his own Person. But both these are great inconveniencies and absurdities, viz. either to say that we are not bound, upon pain of damnation, unto obeying the Gospel of Christ, and keeping the Laws of God in our own Person, (which is the thing called Holiness, without which no Man shall see God :) Or else to say that Christ dyed in vain, or that the *Passive* Obedi-

obedience of our Saviour was needless, and superfluous, as it would have been, if Christ his active obedience had been so reckoned, and imputed to us, that we should be accounted of God to have done whatsoever he did, *i. e.* to have fulfilled all righteousness actually, and actively, &c.

LXIII.

Yet nevertheless Jesus Christ his conformity to the whole Law of God, or being made under the Law, consider it as a part of his *Humiliation*, and Exinanition, was certainly one part, and degree of the *Satisfaction*, which he made to the Justice of God for Believers. For though it behoved Christ when he became man, and dwelt amongst men, to have been conformable to the Law of his Creation, it doth not follow that by that his conformity to the Law he did no way satisfy for us. For if any man being free, and *sui juris*, do oblige himself not only to die, on the behalf of another, but to serve a hard Apprentiship first, may he not be said to make satisfaction in part, as well by the hard service which he undergoes, as by dying for him at the expiration of such a time of servitude? For though he were bound upon pain of present death, to such acts of servitude, or slavery, after that he had taken that condition upon him, yet forasmuch as he was not bound to have taken upon him the condition of a slave, or servant, but that it was his free will, and pleasure, so to do, in order to satisfying the debt, or of-

fence of another person : I say, in that regard, his so doing could not be said to be the paying of one debt with another. A *Surety* when he has taken upon him that relation is bound to pay the whole debt, if the Principal debtor faileth; do's it therefore follow, that because it belongs to him, in that case, as he is a *Surety*, to pay the debt, that therefore his payment is not satisfactory, or that it is but the paying of one debt with another? *viz.* the debt of his friend, with the debt of his *suretiship*, or of his relation as a *Surety*? Forasmuch as he was voluntarily a *Surety*, in order to freeing, or satisfying such a debt (which he needed not to have been) his payment is good, for another, &c.

XLIV.

Christ did some things which did not belong to him to do meerly as he was a *man*, nor yet as he was of such a nation, *viz.* a *Jew*, but did belong only to sinful men, as such, to do, *viz.* he suffered himself to be *Circumcised*, and *Oblations* to be offered for him, *Luke* 2. 21, 24. he was conformable to several other Ceremonial Laws, *John* 7. 2, 10. *Mat.* 26. 17. He was baptized, and he seems to have eaten the Lord's Supper with his Disciples. And he calls these works the fulfilling of Righteousness. Now these things were not absolutely necessary to constitute the Sanctity, Justice, and purity of Christ, or by the Law of his Creation. To those things therefore Christ seems to have been bound meerly by a peculiar compact with his Father, partly

in

in order to his greater *Humiliation*, and partly in order to the better promoting of our Salvation. Moreover, those observances, though they were not absolutely necessary to the holyness of Christ, or of any man, antecedently to the command of God injoyning, and imposing them, yet consequently upon that they were, as was the positive Law of abstaining from the *Tree of the knowledge of good and and evil*. And though those outward observances, separated from inward Sanctity, are but the bark or shell of Religion, which God makes nothing of, *Isa. 1. 12, &c. 66. 3.* yet as performed by him, who was God, and consequently a great branch, and sign of humiliation, and subjection, they cannot but be of great merit, and conduce much to promote that satisfaction which he undertook for believers, &c. Yet forasmuch as Christians now a days are not bound to some of these observances, *ex gr.* to Circumcision, to Sacrifices, &c. and as for other of them, they are bound to observe them in their own persons, as namely *Baptism*, and the *Lords Supper*, &c. that kind of Obedience cannot be said to have been, or to be imputed to believers, in any such strict sense, as if Christ had performed it in their place, and steed: yet it must be said, that that part of Christs obedience was accepted of God as a part of that *λυτρον*, or price of Redemption, which was due for our sins, and so far forth, or in that looser sense, imputed.

X L V.

Christ's submitting himself to a mean condition, as *taking upon him the form of a servant, and making himself of no reputation*, were not Essential to the purity of his nature, or necessary in order to his own Salvation (who being God could not miscarry) but were a part of God's Curse due for sin, and necessary to promote the Salvation of Believers. Therefore these things were a part of Christs *Satisfaction*, which is after a sort imputed to us for righteousness; but not in such manner as if Christ had taken these things upon him in our place, and stead, for neither are we thereby made free from that kind of life, *viz.* from servitude, and meaness; nor are we bound to govern our own lives according to that pattern, and as many are tied to any such thing, are tied thereto, in their own person, I say to undergo it (say it be the condition of meer servants) in their own persons, and not by Christ their *Surety*.

X L V I.

It may be of great use to understand aright, & to bear in mind what is the true notion of *Imputation*, or what the word *Imputed* meaneth. Imputation (therefore) is the Acceptation of (*Numb* 18. 26, 30.) one thing for another. He is righteous, or just by *Imputation*, who being in himself guilty of a fault, yet is accounted righteous, or *guiltless*, for the sake of something else which is admitted, or accepted, in the place, or stead of that justice,

justice, or righteousness, which ought to have been inherent in himself. The thing so accepted is called *Imputed Righteousness*. And it is so called because it is a righteous thing, to give, and take satisfaction, or compensation, for sin committed, *Him God hath held forth for a propitiation that God might be just, &c.* If this justice, or righteousness be full and adequate to the fault committed, it removeth the desert of punishment from the guilty, and extinguisheth all obligation therunto. The Justification of a person not inherently just, but guilty, is when the fault of which the party is accused is acknowledged; but something else is tendered, or pleaded for it, by which he may be vindicated from the merit of condemnation. Nor can any other way be found out whereby a guilty person may be justified, &c. when the desert of condemnation is removed, the fault it self is after a sort extinguished, as if it had never been committed, &c. Vide *Bradshaw, de Justif. cap. 5.*

XLVII.

After all that has been said touching the righteousness of Christ, its being the *Material cause* of our Justification, and the Imputation thereof, the *Form* or *Formal cause* of our Justification; I must needs own it for a truth, that Believers are in Scripture frequently denominated just, or righteous persons, from that righteousness, or holiness which is inherent in them: yea, it cannot be denied but by vertue thereof they are formally just, and righteous, though but with an im-

imperfect righteousness, &c. *Luke 1.6.* 'Tis said of *Zachary*, and *Elizabeth*, *They were both righteous before God, walking in all the commandments of God blamelessly*, *Iſa. 38. 3.* Remember, O Lord, said *Hezekiah*, &c. So we read of righteous *Abel*, *Mat. 23. 35.* and that the righteous shall go into life eternal. *1 Joh. 3. 7.* He that doth righteousness is righteous. So it is said of *Job*, *ch. 1. 1.* that he was an upright, i. e. a right, or righteous man, one that feared God, and eschewed evil. Neither is this at all to the prejudice of the Doctrine of Justification, only by, and for the righteousness of Christ imputed to us. For it is one thing to be righteous with an inherent, habitual, imperfect righteousness, which may serve for some other good uses, and purposes; as namely, to glorifie God, and adorn the Gospel, to do some good therewith to our selves, and others; and another thing to be righteous with a compleat, perfect righteousness, whereby we are free'd from the Curse, or Condemning power of the Law, and have right and title given us to eternal life; forasmuch as all our sins, as well of *Omission*, as *Commission*, are satisfied for by Christ: and the believer thereupon is left no more liable to punishment either of *Sense*, or *Loss*, that is, either to Hell, or to the missing of Heaven; than if he had in his own person made God a plenary amends for all the injury which he had done him. From inherent righteousness, a man is reckoned by God, as righteous only to such a degree, (as we call School-boys *Scholars*, because they have some little learning, but not enough

to fit them for the University, or whereby to claim a degree there.) So holy men from that imperfect righteousness which they have by Gods gracious condescension, are termed just, or righteous, but not with a righteousness which renders them altogether guiltless, and faultless in the sight of God, as doth that righteousness whereby they are justified. Therefore from their inherent righteousness, though good men are denominated *just*, yet they are not from thence ordinarily denominated *justified*, nor at all but in a less strict, and proper sense.

XLVIII.

As for the danger of the Doctrine of Justification by the righteousness of Christ imputed to Believers in point of debauching the lives of men, they are worse scar'd than hurt, who dream of any such thing: For first, They who preach that Doctrine, do constantly teach, that whomsoever God justifieth, he sanctifies at the same time, and that that faith which is the instrument of their justification, is always such as doth purifie their hearts, produce good works, work by love, and that which doth not is a dead faith, and consequently, that *no unrighteous person* (because every such person is void of true faith) *shall inherit the Kingdome of God*. They tell the people that they shall as certainly be damned if they live and die without holyness, and good works, as if men were to be saved by a righteousness inherent in themselves. Again, They tell them, that men *who by patient continu-*
ance

ance in well doing, do seek life and glory, shall as certainly be saved, as if their so doing were truly meritorious; yea a valuable price, or purchase, of salvation; or as if they might claim, and challenge heaven for so doing, though when all is done, they must confess themselves to have been unprofitable servants, and that eternal life is the *free gift of God through Jesus Christ our Lord*. Who then can say more, in effect, either to deter men from the commission of sin by the danger of hell fire it self, or to encourage men to the practice of true Religion: mean time preserving the honor of the free grace of God in Jesus Christ? In this behalf the opposers of *Imputed Righteousness*, deal as disingeniously, and slanderously, with those of the other perswasion, as the *Papists* do against the *Protestants*, in all whose accusations of that nature, as to the generality of Orthodox Protestants, there is not one word of truth. For neither do they who contend earnestly for Justification only by Christs righteousness imputed to us, set at naught holiness, as a needless thing, and that without which men may be saved by Christ: neither can any such inference be with any colour of reason, drawn from their opinion, as touching the Righteousness of Christ being the only *Material*, and the *Imputation* of that Righteousness, the only *Formal* cause of Justification.

Is it not enough that they do all own inherent righteousness, or Holiness, to be *causa sine qua* non of Justification, and Salvation? As he that hath a great sum of money owing him (admit

a thousand pounds) cannot receive it unless he will give him that is to pay it an *Acquittance*, no more than if it were not due to him, though his owing of the money is the only cause why he is content to pay it, not because he to whom he should pay it, will give him a Note to shew for so much received, for had he not owed it he would have cared for no such Note, nor have payed such a sum, to have received a Million of such Notes as those, &c.

What Creditor do's not hold himself as much concerned to give an *Acquittance*, when demanded, in order to receiving a great sum of money, that is due to him, because without so doing he cannot receive it, as if he had no other right to it, or it were not due to him upon any other account ?

XLIX.

Before I come to treat of the *Instrumental Cause* of Justification, which is *Faith* alone, it may be necessary to assign the reason, or causes why I have placed Justification not in the *Remission of sins*, as some do; but in God's *accounting, esteeming, and pronouncing* a Believing sinner righteous to Eternal Life; I say, There are sufficient reasons to be given why Justification should be placed *not in Remission of sin*, but in *accounting, and declaring*, the justified Person righteous.

L.

To pardon an Offence is, in strictness of speaking, nothing else but to remit the punishment of it, or not to punish it; as when a Malefactor worthy of Death, or Banishment, and Sentenced thereunto, hath that Sentence reversed, or taken off, but is not intituled to any reward, or priviledge. But to justifie a sinner is not only to take off the Sentence of damnation that did lye against him (as the Scripture saith, *He that believeth not is condemned already,*) but by accounting and making him savingly righteous to give him right, and title to Eternal Life. Now, to reward (especially with so great a reward as Heaven, or to intitle a Man thereunto) is much more than not to punish him with Hell, and Eternal Death.

L I.

Yet I shall not lay very much stress upon that first Argument, because it may be said that the punishment due to sinners consists not only in the miseries, and torments of Hell, but also in the loss of Heaven; so that if the whole punishment be taken away, (or which is all one, the sinner sully pardoned) he is by means thereof restored to a right and Title to Eternal Life. As if a Father who has declared that he will not only beat his Son, for some great Offence, but also disinherit him, shall pardon him, to all intents, and purposes; his so doing must extend not only to the not beating of him,

him, but also unto the owning, and accepting of him for his Heir, or re-instating him into his Inheritance.

LII.

Therefore in Order to proving that Justification doth not consist in *remission of sins*, I shall rather trust to these (and some following) Arguments. First, If wheresoever in the Scripture we find the word *Justifie* instead thereof we should put *Pardon*, where *Justification*, *Pardoning*, where *Justified*, *Pardoned*; the notion, or construction thence arising will be found senseless, and absurd, then to *Justifie* in the Language of Scripture (which must be adhered to, and must decide this controversie) is one thing, and to *Pardon* is another, *Justification* one thing, and *Pardon of sin* another. But so it is, witness these Instances, besides many more which might be alledged, *Dent. 25. 1. They shall pardon* (instead of *justifie*) *the guiltless, and condemn the Wicked.* *Psal. 51. 4. That thou mayst be pardoned when thou judgest,* *Mat. 11. 19. Wisdom is pardoned of her Children,* *1 Tim. 4. 16. Pardoned in the Spirit.*

If a Man Examine all the places in *Moses and the Prophets*, where the term of *Justification* is used, he shall find none where *pardon of sin* is thereby signified. *Vide Gataker, p. 13.*

LIII.

A Man may be *Pardoned*, and yet not *Justified*: *Justified*, amongst Men, and not *Pardoned*,

Pardoned, *Ergo*. *justification*, and *pardon* are two distinct things. For it is an undoubted Axiom, *Quæ subjecta differunt inter se differunt*. Those things that differ in subject, that is, the one whereof may be found in some Subject where the other is not, are distinct, and divers one from another. Now, *remission* may be where *justification* is not; and *justification* may be where *remission* is not. If a Man have wronged me, I may forgive him, as *David* did *Shimei*, and yet not *justify* him in his dealings. And when a Man is falsely accused of wrong done to another, then he may be justified and yet nothing remitted, because no wrong at all done. So we are said to *justify* God, *Psal.* 51. 4.

Though in regard of a man's State, God never remits sin where he do's not *justify*; yet in regard of some particular acts, he remits sin sometimes where he justifies not, *Psal.* 78. 37, 38. *Though their hearts were not upright with him, yet even of his compassion he forgave their iniquity, and destroyed them not*. So far forth remitted it as not instantly to destroy them for it. And sometimes God *justifies* when he *remits* not, as he did in approving *Phineas* his Act, as a just and righteous Act, *Psal.* 106. 30, 31. And as he is said to *justify* the Prophet *Esay*, in the discharge of his Ministry, *Esay* 50. 8. If a Man that hath wronged another do obtain his *Pardon* without giving him real Satisfaction, in case he be questioned for it another time, he may plead his *Pardon*, but not stand upon his *justification*. But if he has given him full Satisfaction by himself,

or Surety, he may stand upon his Justification, and plead not guilty, because he can plead *satisfaction* made, and accepted. And this latter, not the former, is the very case betwixt God, and Man in the justifying of a sinner: Satisfaction is the main ground of the Justification of him, not made by him, but by Christ for him. To this point *Bellarmin*, *de justif.* l. 1. c. 2. Speaks as well as any Protestant, and far beyond the *Socinians*; vide *Gataker*, p. 14, 15, 16.

LIV.

Justification is the cause of *Remission* of sins, and *Remission* of sins is the proper effect of *Justification*; therefore those two things must needs be different, and distinct. To pardon an Offender is not to punish him, or to exempt him from all manner of punishment due to him for such an Offence (whether it be punishment of sense, or of loss) And the reason why God doth forbear to punish a sinner, is, because he looks upon him as a guiltless Person, for as much as he hath satisfied for his Offences, by his Surety Jesus Christ. *Guilt* is our Obligation to punishment, but when full Satisfaction is rendered, and accepted, there remains no more Obligation to punishment. And therefore it is that God doth look upon a Believer as guiltless, with reference to eternal punishments (which are by Christ satisfied for) and thereupon beareth for ever to inflict any such punishment upon, or denounce it against him. Whence it appeareth that *Pardon* of sin is the effect of *Justification*,

E

fication, and consequently, is after it, *ordine nature*, though not *temporis*, and so cannot be the same thing.

L V.

To pardon an Offender may be an Act of meer *Favour*, and *Mercy*, and doth most properly signifie the forgiveness, which is without Satisfaction. But for God to justifie a Believing Sinner is an Act of *Justice*. God's Justice doth as well appear in acquitting us for Christ, as in exacting a payment for us from Christ, *Isa.* 53. 7. Justice in Civil Courts consists as well in acquitting the Guiltless, as in condemning the Guilty, *Deut.* 25. 1. The Justification of a sinner is transacted not by a meer Sovereign, and absolute Power alone, but in a Legal way; whence it is the Apostle saith, that *the Law is not thereby infringed, but established*, *Rom.* 3. 31. For Christ in the Scripture is termed not only *mediator*, a *Mediator*, *1 Tim.* 2. 6. or one that by perswasion, and interest indeavours to compose the difference between them, but he is said to be also *homo* a Surety, *viz.* as God's Surety to Man for the performance of his promises which are *all in Christ, yea and Amen*, *2 Cor.* 1. 20. So *Man's Surety to God for the discharge of the debt of all those that have interest in him*, and making satisfaction to God by doing, and induring whatsoever was necessary for that purpose, *Esay* 53. 6. *We all had strayed, and the Lord had caused the iniquity of us all to remain on him.* It was exacted (as *Junius* rightly renders

ders it) and he answered, that is, engag'd himself for the Discharge of it, as Cappel well renders the word, yea, he did really answer it, as we say of a party, or Surety that hath made payment, that he hath answered the Debt; vide Gataker; p 27, 28.

L V I.

That God is said to pardon, or forgive those whom he justifieth, though he has received satisfaction for their Offences; is made a proper kind of speaking; and a true notion, for that he exempts them from punishment; as they do who pardon others, and not only so, but exerteth as much of Grace, and Mercy, towards the justified Person in the manner of doing it, as if he had remitted his Offences without any satisfaction given, or demanded. Hence, saith Bernard, vide Gataker, p. 23, 24. *Thou art saved by nothing, but not saved with nothing, for nothing laid down by thee, but not without a price pay'd by Christ.*

L V I I.

The justifying of a Sinner is not meerly the accepting of him as savingly just, and Righteous, but the making of him so, Rom. 5. 18. 2 Cor. 5. 21. It is not (as one calls it) the remitting of the penalty of the Law, and so discharging a guilty Person, as if he were innocent, and righteous, not according to Law and Justice, but out of a Sovereign and absolute Power. A Man who before was not just cannot truly be justified unless he

first be made, or constituted just, Gataker 33: The word *Justifie* doth not signifie in common use to *make just*; yet a Man that hath done wrong that he may be justified, must be first made just, not inherently just, for though he were so, yet that would not be sufficient to clear him from the guilt of his former unjust Act (as of theft, &c.) but he must be so made just, *i. e.* guiltless, and blameless, as that he may answer the rigor of Law and Justice, e're he can truly be justified, and this cannot be done but by a plenary satisfaction for the wrong done and the Offence formerly committed, exhibited, and accepted.

Now, that which is exhibited by doing, or suffering, or both, in way of Satisfaction, and so accepted, being such as makes a plenary satisfaction for an Offence formerly committed, because it utterly extinguisheth, and abolisheth the wrong, so taketh it away as if it had never been, it justly procures a guiltlessness, and blamelessness, to the Delinquent, in whose behalf it is performed, and makes him therefore to be reputed in the eye of the Law, and Justice, as therefore now no delinquent, but as guiltless, faultless, and just.

LVIII.

Mr. Gataker, p. 34. saith, that not the *Satisfaction* it's self, but the *Guiltlessness* thereby procured is that which is so often in Scripture termed, *Justice* or *Righteousness* called the *Righteousness* of God, Rom. 1. 17. & 3. 21, 22. & 2 Cor.

2 Cor. 5. 21. because prepared propounded and appointed us by God (for God as the party wronged, and Christ as the party satisfying for this wrong, are in this Argument distinguished, Rom. 3. 24, 25. 2 Cor. 5. 19, 21.)

LIX.

The Justification spoken of in the Scripture is such a Justification as wherein there is a special manifestation of God's *Justice*, Rom. 3. 26. whereas in such case, which in plain terms is no other than meer pardon, there may be an ample declaration of *Mercy*, but no such demonstration of *Justice* at all.

LX.

They are mistaken who say that the word *δικαιοσύνη* when applyed to *Justification*, doth signify *moderation, equity, grace, and mercy*, in pardon of sin; and that the word *ἐλεος* imports only a *merciful, charitable person*, &c. Vide Gattaker, p. 24.

That the word *δικαιός*, or *Righteous* is used in the New Testament with an eye to Retributive Justice consisting in acquitting the guiltless, and doing Justice upon the guilty, may appear from the ensuing Texts, viz. *John* 7. 2. *John* 5. 30. *Rev.* 15. 3. *Rev.* 16. 5, 7. *Rev.* 19. 11. *1 John* 2. 29. *2 Tim.* 4. 8. Let *Grosius* and *Hammond* consult their own Expositions on these Texts one of which doth Expressly so Interpret, *2 Tim.* 4. 8. though there not so necessarily, because the allusion is there to the Judges, or

Triers at the Olympick Games ; Again, *Rom.* i. 32. and *Rom.* 2. 5. where 'tis apparent that *Punitive Justice* is meant also, *Rom.* 3. 4, 5. expounded by the next words, *Is God unrighteous in taking vengeance ? Rom.* 9. 28, 14. *2 Thes.* i. 6. *Gattaker* 24, 25, 26, 27.

L X I.

Though as *Justifying* is sometimes taken for approving, or vindicating an innocent person that is wrongfully accused, or approving a just action, as that of *Phineas* ; I say, though as the word is taken in that sense, God is said to *justify* when he do's not pardon ; yet so as the word *justify* is taken when God is said to *justify the ungodly*, *Rom.* 4. 5. (which is the usual acceptation of it, and that which we here enquire after) God doth never *justify* but he doth also *pardon*. Remission of Sins is a necessary consequent of efficacious Justification, grounded upon satisfaction tendered, and accepted, made, and admitted. When satisfaction for an injury is made and accepted, and the party that did it in regard thereof justified, that is, thereby thereof discharged, Reason and equity requires that the offence be *remitted*, that is, that the party wronged cease now to be offended with him whom he was justly offended with before. *Vide Gattaker* 25.

L X I I.

Because when God doth *justify* a sinner, he doth always *pardon* his sins (as hath been said)
and

and Remission of sins, or exemption from punishment, or reversing the sentence of condemnation, are immediate effects, and consequents of Justification: therefore it is that some excellent Divines have put *Remission* of sins into their description of *Justification*, though certain it is, that they do differ as the *cause*, and the *effect*. For God doth therefore remit sin, or take off the the penalty due for sin, because he justifies the sinner, and do's own, and acknowledg him to be guiltless; that is, justly liable to no such penalty, forasmuch as the justice of God is by Christ satisfied for him, inasmuch as he is a true believer. God doth not justifie men, because he has pardoned them (as a Prince might do a man-slayer whom by his Prerogative he has pardoned) but because he *justifieth* them, or acknowledges them just and righteous upon account of the satisfaction which he has received from Christ on their behalf, therefore he pardoneth them, or exempteth them from punishment, &c.

LXIII.

Justification seemeth to wash a sinner cleaner, than bare *pardon* would have done; forasmuch as *Justification* taketh away not only the *penalty* that was incurr'd by sin, but the very *desert* of that penalty, which *bare pardon* seemeth not to do. He who hath made full satisfaction for an offence, after that is done, is not worthy, or do's not deserve to suffer for it, because the crime is thereby extinguished, and annihilated, but

he who has received only a free pardon (as for murder, or the like) though that is sufficient to save his life, yet it cannot take away his *demerit*, or *desert* to die, &c. Indeed every justified person before satisfaction accepted, and taking place in him, *i. e.* before he did believe, did deserve to die eternally, till after the satisfaction of Christ applyed by faith, he can no longer be said to be under the guilt, or just *demerit* of damnation, &c. Whereas *Amesius* saith in his *Chap. de Justif.* That *Justification* doth not so take away the guilt, as that it takes away the *desert* of punishment from the sin; which (the sin it self remaining) can in no sort be taken away, but it so takes away the guilt, that it takes away the deadly effects of it. I say, those words of his are fairly consistent with what I have said: For though a *desert* of punishment be always inseparable from the nature of sin it self, yet he that was a *sinner*, may cease, so much as to deserve punishment, I say, a *demerit* of punishment is separable from a *sinner*, or one that was so, but not from *sin*, or from one in whom the sin it self is remaining; (as *Amesius* speaketh) but from one, in whom it is taken away, by the application of the blood of Christ.

L X I V.

Whereas some great Divines have put into their Definition, that *Justification* is an act of God wherein he accepteth us as righteous in his sight; which words may seem to imply that *Believers* are not really righteous in the sight of God,

God, but meerly accepted as such, or *as if* they were such (as he that pays but half a crown in the pound, may have, by the clemency of his Creditor s, a full discharge given him *as if* he had pay'd all) I conceive their meaning may be this; that Believers are, as to all the benefits and advantages of righteousness, or of being righteous, so accepted with God upon account of that righteousness of Christs, which is theirs by *Imputation* only, as if they had had a real *inherent* righteousness of their own, whereby they had been *formally* righteous in the strictest sense; as a man is wise by his wisdom, and strong by his strength. They may put an *as*, (or a *tanquam* to it) because we do not hold that the righteousness, or obedience of Christ is the *Form* of Justification in that *Formal sense* as the rational Soul is the form of a man; but only that it do's *supplero vicem, & locum cause formalis*, that is, doth stand a Believer in as good stead, for matter of security from hell, and intitling him to heaven, as a compleat perfect righteousness inherent in himself could do. Even as the payment made by a *Surety* do's to all intents as much secure the *principal* debtor, as if he himself had done it; yet can he not in a strict sense be said to be so good a paymaster as if he had made payment himself.

L X V.

How God when he justifieth can be said to justify us from all our sins at once, or to pardon to us all our sins, as well those that are to come,

as those that are past, is a thing me-thinks as difficult to explain, as any one thing belonging to the great Doctrine of Justification.

Amesius in his *Chap. de Justif.* sect. 24. saith this, *Sins past are remitted by a formal application, but sins to come only virtually: Sins past are remitted in themselves, sins to come in the subject or person sinning, &c.*

L X V I.

'Tis hard to find a similitude that may sufficiently illustrate that darksome saying of the Reverend *Amesius*; yet I think some light may be given thereunto by such a similitude, or similitudes as follow.

Admit an Annuity of fourscore pounds a year settled upon any person for the time of his life, to be paid by quarterly portions, 20*l.* every quarter, upon condition that he shall come to such a one to receive it, as oft as it becomes due, and shall give him an Acquittance, wherein he shall greatly acknowledg his thankful acceptance of the Doner's bounty. In this case, I say, there is fourscore pound a year settled upon the foresaid party all at once, *virtually*, for by one deed he is made capable of challenging it in such equal proportions as oft as it shall become due, making good the forementioned proviso's, *viz.* that he come himself in person for it, to the party that is appointed to pay it, and do give him a thankful Acquittance, &c. Till the proviso's upon which the actual payment of each Sum of Money be complied with, he cannot

not actually receive it, but yet it was all *virtually* vested in him from the very first, and he from the first time he was instated in the Annuity, put into a capacity to receive it, from time, to time, as it should grow due. Or possibly the thing may be better explained by some such similitude as this.

A rich Father sending his Son to travel beyond the Seas, desires a great Merchant of that country, in which his Son is to reside, to defray all his expences, and to pay off all the bills which shall be brought in upon his account, provided he shall from time, to time bring the bills of his charges, and expences to him, and request him to see them fully discharged; and in case any of his bills appear to have been inflam'd by great prodigality, and extravagancy he shall confess, and bewail his fault, and promise amendment; and having so done, then, and not till then, the Merchant aforesaid, is, and shall be requested to make full payment to all his Creditors, and to see all, and every of his debts discharged. The Son whose case this is may be said to have all his debts *virtually* pay'd, from the time that his Father took order with such a Merchant for the payment of them, who undertook to see it done, because by this means, he can command his debts at any time, doing in order thereunto only some certain things which are in his power to do: yet the debts of this Son cannot be said to be *actually* pay'd, because many of them are not yet contracted, as to others of them, he has not yet carried in his bill

to

to the Merchant that undertook to pay whatso-
ever he should owe, or he hath not as yet con-
fessed, and bewailed his fault, as to some debts
contracted by great Profuseness, which was to
precede the payment of them, and therefore
the *actual* payment of them is yet suspended
notwithstanding it is in his power to procure
the actual payment of them, at no long warn-
ing, by doing such previous things as are in his
power to do, and therefore may all his debts be
said to be *virtually* paid, but not *actually*.

The accommodation of that similitude to
the purpose in hand is very easie. Or, suppose
a Prince has a Favourite, so great in his favour
that he hath resolved that he shall never be put
to Death for any offence that he can pardon to
him, and yet the said Favourite falls time, af-
ter time, into such misdemeanors, for which he
cannot but be arraigned by Law, and sentenced
to Death according to the common course of
Justice; yet forasmuch as the Supreme Mag-
istrate has given him assurance that he shall not
dye for any offence that he can pardon, and
consequently upon humble application for a
particular pardon, so oft as he is condemned
afresh, he is sure to obtain it; this man may be
said to be pardoned *virtually*, though not *actu-
ally*, &c.

LXVII.

An Elect, Believing, and therefore justified
Sinner, may be said to have all his sins pardo-
ned *virtually*, and in the *Subject*, or Person sin-
ning,

ing, though not in themselves (as *Amesius* speaketh) because God hath resolved, yea, so ordered, and fore-laid the matter that such a one shall not be finally lost, and undone, condemn'd, and damn'd: but that the satisfaction of Christ shall, from time, to time be so effectually applyed by him, for, and in order unto taking away the guilt, or condemning power of sin, that eventually it shall never be his ruin.

LXVIII.

Though all the sins of such a one may be said to be pardoned in *Subiecto*, or in, and as to the Person sinning, meaning thereby forasmuch as 'tis certain he shall not be damned for his sins, he hath a pardon *tantum*. Yet may some of his sins be said not to be *actually* pardoned, seeing it is a real truth, that to suppose a Believer might live or dye without renewed Faith, and Repentance, after the commission of some great, and deliberate sin, were to suppose he might be damn'd. For such sins do deprive even Believers, and justified Persons themselves, though not of *jus ad rem*, as to matter of *Salvation*, yet of *jus in re*. In which sense these words of St. *John* are to be understood, viz. *No murderer hath eternal Life abiding in him*, i. e. hath an immediate, actual fitness, and capacity for Heaven, at the present, as those that were unclean, or in a Journey had not for partaking of the Lord's Passover, though they had a habitual right to it.

LXIX.

That Man cannot be said to be Actually and compleatly pardoned, who has any block or bar in his way to Heaven for the present, or who cannot enter into Life, or be saved under his present circumstances, which may be the case of a true Believer, and justified Person (witness *David*, &c.) therefore every justified Person is not compleatly and actually pardoned, all his sins, at all times, but some may yet be after a sort, charged upon him: yet sith an Elect Believer shall certainly have all those blocks taken out of his way, first, or last, or before he dyes, all his sins may be said to be virtually pardoned, and in equivalency. As that man might virtually, and in effect, be said to be secured from dying by the means of a *Pleurisie*, who hath a Physitian alwayes at hand, perfectly able (if there be any such) and as willing to Cure him of it, because in that case his Life would be secured from that Disease *virtually*, yet could he not be said to be *actually* delivered from that Disease, or the danger of it, in case he were apt ever, and anon to fall into it, to such a degree, that if great means, and remedies were not used it would be sure to be his death, &c. So would the greater, and deliberate sins of justified Persons, certainly be the death of their Souls if Jesus Christ their great Physitian, did not from time to time, by renewing Faith in them, whereby to take hold of the Satisfaction and expiation which he by his blood

blood has made in such cases, relieve them against the same, which sheweth that though they be *virtually* pardoned, as to all their sins, yet not compleatly, actually, and to all intents, and purposes : for as Divines say, there can be no such pardon obtained for any great, and wilful sin, without particular renewing of Faith, and Repentance. In that sense it is that they do own these kind of sins to be *mortal*, and not to have a pardon of course, as lesser sins have upon a general Repentance, which therefore they call *venial*.

L X X.

Reverend Mr. *Durham* in his Book on the *Revelation*, p. 259. puts the Question in these words (for I chuse to give you his own) *How can a man at the first exercising of Faith be said to be justified or pardoned of all his sins, seeing his sins after Justification are not pardoned till they be committed, and Repented of ?*

His Answer thereunto is in these words.

Both are true (saith he) for future sins are not actually pardoned till they be committed, and repented of, yet is the man a justified person, and in a justified estate, having a ground laid in his justification for obtaining the pardon of those sins that follow, so that they shall not overturn his former Absolution, for Gods Covenant hath both fully in it, yet in due way to be applied. And it is (saith he) as if a company of Rebels were subdued, and by Treaty they are pardoned, changed from the state of Enemies, to be natural Subjects, and priviledged with their

their priviledges, so that if they fall in after faules (as Subjects may fall in) yet are they never again counted Enemies, nor is their first Freedom Cancel'd, but they are dealt with as native Subjects falling into such offences, and have priviledges that Strangers have not, nor can plead in the same faults; one of which priviledges may be supposed to be, that they shall not be rigidly fallen upon, although their guilt deserve death, but that they shall have means used to reclaim them, (and these such as cannot but be effectual) and that upon recovery they shall be pardoned those faults, and be preserved from the deserved punishments, &c. It is so by the Treaty of Grace, and Justification; the believing Sinner is translated from the state of an Enemy, to the condition of a Friend, this is unalterable, he cannot afterwards but be a Friend; yet because a Friend may be ingrateful, and may fail to his Benefactor, therefore in this Treaty it is provided, that there shall be a way to forgiveness by vertue of the Covenant, yet so as there shall be a new exercise of Repentance and Faith, for the commending of the way of grace: And so a sinning Believer is a sinner, but not in the state of sin, nor is an Enemy as he was before Justification, even as a faulty Subject is guilty, yet is no Enemy, nor Rebel, nor can be punished by death when he becomes penitent, although he deserveth it, because the Law of Grace is such to the Subjects of that Kingdom, that the pleading of that former Treaty, and betaking themselves to the terms hereof, is ever to be accepted as a righteousness for them in reference to any particular sin following Justification, as well as what proceeded. And this no
Stranger

Stranger to God can plead, who hath no such ground for his recovery from sin, or that God will give him Repentance for it, much less that he will certainly pardon him. Yea it differeth from a Penitents case at first conversion, because a Covenanters may expect pardon by vertue of that same Covenant in which he is engaged, and to which he hath already right, and he hath *Jus ad rem*: Another cannot do so, but must consider the Covenant as aforesaid only, and so expect pardon, not because God is actually engaged to give it to him, as in the others case, but because God doth offer to accept of him on those terms, and then to pardon him. Thus far Mr. Durham, &c.

L X X I.

Besides the principal efficient cause of Justification, which is God, the inwardly moving or Proegumenal cause which is *Free Grace*, the Pro-catarctick cause which was Jesus Christ, the Material cause which was the Obedience of Christ, the Formal cause, viz. the Imputation of Christs Obedience, and the Final cause, all which have been spoken of already, and proved to be such: there is another cause of Justification, which might have been brought in under the efficient (for thereunto it belongs as *efficiens minus principalis*) viz. the Instrumental cause which is very necessary to be discoursed of by all those who treat of Justification, forasmuch as there are some considerable controversies which do depend upon it. Now the Instrumental cause or condition of Justification (for you may call it either

in different respects) is *Faith*: I call *Faith* the *Instrument* of Justification, not that it is so immediately (for that might seem to ascribe unto man some kind of efficiency in point of justifying himself) but *mediately*, forasmuch as it is the hand whereby, or wherewith, a Believer receiveth the Righteousness of Christ, by the imputation of which Righteousness he is justified. So that as properly as the cause of a cause may be said to be the cause of that cause its *effect*, (as the Grandfather of the Granchild) may *Faith* be said to be the *Instrument* of Justification, it being the instrument of applying, or receiving that Righteousness, by which Believers are justified.

They must needs own *Faith* to be *Instrumental* in, and towards Justification, who affirm it to be the *condition* thereof: For doubtless to perform the condition of any promise made by a faithful person, must needs be *instrumental* for, and towards the performance and enjoyment of the promise it self, sith a faithful promiser when the condition of the promise which he hath made is performed, cannot but perform his promise, if it be in his power. Yea forasmuch as *Faith* is the one onely condition upon which the promise of *Justification* is suspended, *Faith*, in strictness of speaking, is the only (to be sure the most principal) instrument of *Justification*: For what is, or can be so instrumental to obtain the benefit of a good man's promise, as to fulfil the condition upon which he suspended it, when that's done, all is done, for that is all in all.

Though

LXXII.

Though there be other more remote, and less principal Instruments of Justification, yet the most immediate, and most principal, and the only *Internal Instrument* thereof is *Faith* alone.

The Word of God, whereby as an instrument, Faith is ingendered: for Faith cometh by hearing, the Ministers of God who dispense that word, and the holy Sacraments which are a kind of visible Gospel, and *Seals of the Righteousness of God which is by Faith*, are remote instruments in the hand of God whereby to bring about the Justification of a sinner, *Dan. 12. 3*: But the most principal, and immediate instrumental cause of Justification, is *Faith*: For that doth *immediate attingere effectum*. Hence such passages as these, *Being Justified by Faith. By him all that believe are Justified.*

LXXIII.

Mr. Gattaker p. 70. saith that *Though to the full enjoyment of life eternal in Heaven are required many conditions in the Covenant of the Gospel, as Faith, Repentance, Charity, Humility, Holiness, Mortification, Self-denial, Obedience, Patience, and Perseverance in good works; yet unto Justification is required only Faith. For excepting that one place of St. James, which assigns Justification to works, ye shall find the Justification of a sinner assigned to Faith constantly, in places almost innumerable, and never attributed either to the Love, or Fear of God, or to Charity, or Patience,*

but to Faith in Christ's blood, Romans 3. 25.

LXXIV.

Mr. Perkins in his *Catholick Reformed, Controvers.* 4. cap. 1. saith, *Faith is the alone, and only Instrument wrought of God in the heart of a man, whereby he laieth hold on Christ, applying his Righteousness to himself, which neither Hope, nor Charity, nor any other Grace can do.*

And Learned Bp. Abbot saith, (writing in defence of Perkins) that *Faith though not negatively considered excluding other Graces, yet privatively abstracted from the consideration of them is said to justifie. The wounded Israelites were cured by meer seeing, or looking at the Brazen Serpent without working, John 3. 14. There believing in Christ is compared unto the beholding of the Brazen Serpent.*

Chemnitius, in his *Examen Concil Trident. de fide Justif.* giving reasons why the Protestants use the word *Sola* of Faith in Justification, maketh one to be *ut ostendatur organum seu medium applicationis.* For not by works, but Faith alone is the Promise received.

Burges, Prop. 1. saith, *They who are for Works and Faith, joyning these in our Justification, ought to leave out the word Sola or only, in Praying, and Preaching.*

LXXV.

If some had rather call *Faith* the *Condition* than the *Instrumental cause* of Justification, provided that by *Faith*, and by *Condition*, they understand

derstand what they ought to do, and will own Faith to be the only Condition of *Justification*, I see no cause to be offended at them.

L X X V I.

It may be safely said that we are justified by Faith, as it is a Condition, provided, the Conditionality of it be limited to the *Receptive* office of Faith, and Gods designment thereunto. *B. Prop. 4.* My meaning is, that *Faith* may be said to justify as it is a Condition, provided you allow it to be the condition of Justification, not as it is an excellent Grace, Quality, or Work; but as it has a peculiar property for the receiving of Christ, and his Righteousness, even as *eating* nourisheth us (or is as I may say the condition of our being nourished) not merely as it is an *action*, for then walking, or speaking, might do the same thing; but as it is that action by which nourishment is received into our bodies. It seemeth indifferent whether we call *Faith* the *Condition*, or the *Instrumental cause* of Justification, and either is done upon the following accounts.

L X X V I I.

Faith is called the Condition of the Covenant, because it is upon that Condition that Justification is offered unto us therein, and upon this Condition God becomes our God, and Christ our Righteousness. And it is also called the Instrumental cause of our Justification, because it acteth by receiving Christ, as he is held

forth in the Word: If that, *viz.* the Gospel be justly called the *External Instrumental* cause which doth offer Christ for our Righteousness, then may *Faith* well be called the *Internal Instrumental* cause, because it doth receive him for the same end, and because by this receiving he becometh our Righteousness, upon which our justification is founded, *Durham*, 234.

LXXVIII.

When we say that *Faith* is the only *Internal Instrument* (for there are several external ones) of our *Justification*, and that it is the condition thereof; our meaning is, that no other work, or grace, is so concern'd in, and with our *Justification*, as *Faith* is, or that justifying of a sinner is not suspended upon any other than the one only condition of believing, though justifying *Faith*, be not alone, yet *Faith* alone justifieth, in the quality of of a condition, and is the only *Internal Instrument* of Justification.

LXXIX.

To be yet more plain (if we can be so) *God* doth not impute the Righteousness of his Son to a sinner, and thereupon make, and account him Righteous to Eternal Life, or one that by his Surety hath satisfied his Law and Justice, with respect had to his *Love*, *Humility*, Repentance, and other Graces (which do accompany saving *Faith*) though upon the account of them also they are by God accounted formally, and inherently, but imperfectly Righteous) but only with regard to his *Faith* considered in a *priva-*

tive abstractiveness, or abstractive from all other graces, forasmuch as the promise of Justification is made to the Grace of *Faith*, and to that alone, or to a Believer only as such.

L X X X.

It is no contradiction to exclude other graces from a *conditionality* as to the act of Justification, and yet to affirm them requisite necessarily in the Subject *justified*, &c. This Protestant Divines do a thousand times over illustrate by divers similitudes. Because Repentance is required as well as Faith must their Office, and work be confounded? Certainly it is not *Repentance*, but *Faith* that receiveth the Pardon.

L X X X I.

The distinction of Faith Justifying, *qua viva*, but not *qua viva*, which is lively, and working, but not as it is lively, and working, is very good, and sound; that is, Though only that Faith which is accompanied with Love to God and Man, godly sorrow for sin and other graces do justifie (because that is the only living and true Faith) yet this living Faith in the business of justifying, or as it justifieth Instrumentally, is not concurr'd with by any other grace, but is by it self alone.

As the Sun which giveth Light, giveth heat also, but it doth not give heat as it is *Corpus luminoso*, but as it is *Corpus calidum*. The heat of the Sun doth not enlighten, nor the light of the Sun heat, and warm. A King that goeth to his Parliament to sign Bills, and compleat

Acts of Parliament, seldom goeth without a considerable Guard, and Retinue, but when all comes to all, 'tis he that signs all the Bills, and the rest of his Company have nothing to do in that affair. So Faith hath a large Retinue of Graces, useful for many other good purposes, but such as do not meddle or make more or less in that great business of Justification, but leave all that affair (as God hath left it) to Faith alone, &c.

L X X X I I.

We may observe, saith Mr. Gataker p. 79. that God's pardon is often ascribed to Repentance as well as to Faith, (Acts 2. 38. Mark 1. 4. & alibi possim) both being conditions of our reconciliation to God, but Justification is only attributed to Faith, but never to Repentance. The Reason (saith he, is evident) because sorrow for sin though serious and effectual in the conversion of a sinner to God, brings not an equivalent satisfaction to the Justice of God, but Faith brings with it the Righteousness of Christ, and tenders the obedience of Christ our Surety as our own unto God for Justification, B. Prop. I.

L X X X I I I.

Though Protestant writers in this controversy did chiefly militate against the *merit*, and *causality* of works in Justification, then asserted by the Papists; yet it is plain that they did thereby exclude their *Conditionality* also as to the act

act of Justification, &c. *We cannot, saith Gattaker, 68. be too zealous in this because the conceit of Justification by Works is a slippery opinion, and we see by Experience how easily, though almost insensibly, the Papists slid and fell by rising in their own proud Imagination from Justification by Works into the presumption of merit, by good works. But the Apostle opposeth the former, and by consequence a Minori ad majus, excludes the latter.*

LXXXIV.

Neither is this Justification by *Faith* alone, excluding the *Conditionality* of Works to be applied to our Justification, at first, only, but as continued: so that first, and last, we are justified by Faith alone, *Gal. 3. 11. The just shall live by Faith*, which belongs to the whole course of their Lives respectively to Justification. And when the Apostle saith, *Rom. 5. Being justified by Faith we have peace with God*; would it not be irrational to limit it only to our Justification at first? Is not the *Righteousness of God revealed from Faith to Faith, not from Faith to Works?* *Rom. 1. 17.*

LXXXV.

That Faith is concerned in the business of Justification only, as a condition, or Instrument, so far, and no farther, is evident, because though the Scripture doth often speak of our being justified *in rebus, & sic dicuntur*, yet never *sic ut* by Faith, yet never for Faith.

LXXXVI.

LXXXVI.

If it be enquired what that Faith is which is the condition or Instrument of Justification; I shall answer no more at present but this, *viz.* Faith is that Grace whereby Jesus Christ is so received to all intents and purposes as he is offered to sinners in the Gospel.

LXXXVII.

The fore-said description of Faith furnisheth us with one Argument for Faith's being the only *Condition*, or *Instrumental* cause of Justification, *Ex. gr.* It is the Righteousness, Obedience, or Satisfaction of Christ imputed, or put to our account which justifieth. That Righteousness is freely offered to sinners in the Gospel to be made theirs upon such terms. Being so offered, there is nothing more requisite to make it ours but our so accepting of it. Now, Faith is that our acceptance of it so as it is offered, &c.

When so accepted the Righteousness of Christ becomes ours, and when it is once actually so, then are we actually justified without any more ado, and other Graces are servicable to us for other purposes, but not to justify us. For *frustra fit per plura*, and when any thing is heartily offered, there needs nothing but accepting it upon the terms specified.

LXXXVIII.

LXXXVIII.

When Faith is spoken of in the Scripture as the *Instrument*, or *Condition* of Justification (call it whether you will) thereby is meant the *Habit*, *Grace*, or *Act* of Faith, such as was expressed, not the *object*, viz. *The Gospel of Christ*, or *Covenant of Grace*, as some would carry it, because the word Faith is sometimes so taken, *Er.gr.Gal.3.23. Before Faith came*. For besides that words are to be taken in the most usual and famous sense, unless there be particular, and special reason to the contrary (which cannot be shewed in those places where Faith is spoken of as the *Instrument* or *Condition* of Justification; I say, besides that, it will be found that if you put the word *Gospel*, or *Covenant of Grace*, instead of the word *Faith* where Faith is spoken of as the *Instrument* of Justification; there will arise a very inconvenient sense.

LXXXIX.

The most usual and general signification of the word *Faith*, is as it is taken for the *Grace* of *Faith*, or the *Actings* thereof, and there is no inconvenient sense arising from taking it so when Faith is spoken of as the *Instrument* of our Justification, *Ergo*. It ought to be so taken. Possibly in fifty places of the New Testament Faith is taken for the *Grace* of Faith, and in very few in any other sense. To be sure it is so taken in *Heb. 11.* where Faith is so much spoken of and defined, v. 1. *Faith is*
the

the substance of things hoped for, &c. v. 4. Faith Abel offered to God, &c. Faith in that Chapter is about sixteen or seventeen times taken for the Grace of Faith, and not for the Gospel of Christ. Neither would any inconvenient construction arise if we take it as meant of the grace of Faith when we are said to be justified by Faith Instrumentally, Ex. gr. Rom. 3. 25. To be a propitiation through Faith in his Blood. Now, though the blood of Christ be the Seal of the New Covenant, yet certainly the Apostle intended not here to speak of that, but of the meanes, on our part, whereby we are made partakers of Christ's Redemption, and propitiation, Gal. 7. 3. So Rom. 5. 1. when the Apostle saith, being justified by Faith, we have Peace with God; why should not Faith be taken for the Grace of Faith correlative to it's object Jesus Christ? So Gal. 2. 16. Even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the Faith of Christ, &c. i. e. by the grace of Faith, or by believing in Jesus Christ.

X C.

Should we take *Faith* for the *Gospel*, or *Covenant of Grace*, in the places last mentioned, as a more unusual, so a more inconvenient, less congruous, and less probable sense would arise from thence, if not untrue, and absurd. *Ex. gr.* when the Apostle saith, *Being justified by Faith*, Rom. 5. 1. We should read being justified by the *Gospel*, or *Covenant of Grace*, against that might be objected that the Gospel justifieth no

Man,

Man, unless it be applyed by *Faith*, men may hear the Gospel, and yet never be justified, but they cannot believe the Gospel, with a true and lively Faith, and not be justified. So those words, *Gal. 2. 16. Knowing that a man is justified by the Faith of Jesus Christ*, ought not to be understood of the *Object* of Faith, viz. the Gospel, but of the *Grace* of Faith, for could he have been justified by the Gospel only (or as the only Instrument of his justification) what need he have added, *even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified*, &c. So 'tis most certain that Jesus Christ is not actually a propitiation for our sins, meerly through the Gospel, or *Covenant of Grace*, unless the Grace of Faith doth intervene actually to interress us in his Sacrifice, and Satisfaction, and therefore it is inconvenient by *Faith in his Blood*, to understand the Gospel, or *Covenant of Grace* sealed with his Blood, &c.

There are two other Texts in *Rom. 3.* which would be very incommodiouly applyed to the Gospel, where *Faith* is mentioned as the Instrument, or Condition of Justification, *v. 22 Even the Righteousness of God which is by Faith of Jesus Christ unto all, and upon all them that believe.* Do not the latter words shew that the *Grace of Faith*, not the *objectum quod* of Faith, which is the Gospel, is there to be understood by *Faith*? To be sure in that latter clause Faith is spoken of as an Instrument, yea, as a condition of Justification. Now, the Gospel, though it is an *external, remote* Instrument of justifying a sinner, as it is
the

the Instrument of *Faith*, or means of *believing*, yet *Faith* is the more immediate Instrument of the two, and a condition also, which the *Gospel* cannot be said to be. Also from v. 26. we argue, that by *Faith* in the 25 verse, not the *Gospel*, but the *Grace of Faith* is meant, because the words are, that he *might be just and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus*.

X C I.

Faith is such an Instrument of Justification as upon which Justification doth always insue: For whosoever truly believeth in Jesus Christ, is, and shall be justified, but so is not the *Gospel*, or the *Covenant of Grace*: For the *Gospel* has been, and may be preached to thousands, who never did, nor ever will come to believe, &c. Now is it not more proper to attribute an effect to the immediate, and effectual cause, than to a cause that is more remote, and often ineffectual? and consequently our Justification, to the *Grace of Faith*, than to the object of *Faith*, viz. the *Gospel*? 'Tis harsh to say that we are justified by that (as namely by the *Gospel*) which we may have, and enjoy, and never be justified, and much easier to conceive how we may be said to be justified by that, (as namely by *Faith*) upon the having (and using) of which, we cannot but be justified.

X C I I.

When we are said to be Justified by *Faith*, as *Rom. 5. 1.* the *Faith* there spoken of, is not

to be taken *Metonymically*, viz. the *cause* put for the *effect*, and Faith which is the root of good works, put for good works, which are the fruit of saving Faith.

X C I I I.

Neither is Faith there taken *Synecdochically* as a part for the whole, or as one *Virtue* for all her inseperable companions, for which a Believer is accepted of a gracious God. Faith is not there taken as a complexive word, that includes *Love*, and *Fear*, and holy *Obedience*, and in Conjunction with all these doth produce Justification.

X C I V.

Thus some by giving the name of *Faith* to all sorts of *Graces*, yea and of *good works*, do hook, and hedge in the Popish Doctrine of Justification by works, under the wing of something called *Faith* (as the *Quakers* do under the name of *Christ*; telling us first, that Christ is the Light within them, and secondly, that to follow the Light within them, whereby they mean nothing else but doing of good works, in conformity to natural Light, will bring us to Heaven.)

X C V.

Those that cannot brook *Justification* by *Faith* alone, as the only *Internal Instrumental* cause, but would concern the whole of Gospel Obedience in the business of Justification, go this way to work, viz. they tell us, that God hath a
double

double Court, one may be compared to our *Kings Bench* (a strict Tribunal of Justice) wherein the Offender is tryed according to Law : So when God proceeds against a sinner accordiag to the *Covenant of works* by the Law, there is no hope of Justification by works, because all have sinned, and the Law is to all a Ministry of Condemnation, and an instrument of death : For there is no mention of Repentance, or room for Reconciliation, in the first covenant of the Law. But God hath set up another Court, as it were of *Chancery*, where *Equity*, or a temperament of equity is admitted, where God by a new Covenant of Mercy moderateth the strictness of the the Law, and requires not exact, but sincere Obedience. And though St. *Paul* deny Justification to the works of the Law, yet he contradicts not St. *James*, who saith a man is justified by good works in Gods *Court of Equity* under the Gospel. And they observe, that though the Sts. do decline God's Judgment, where exact Justice keeps the Court, yet the Sts. 'often plead their own Righteousness before a Merciful God, who accepts their sincere endeavours, and acts of Obedience. *The Socinians please themselves with this distinction who deny Christs Satisfaction*, and consequently acknowledg no use of Faith in his blood ; for apprehending, or applying of Christs Righteousness for our Justification, and teach that a man is justified by his operative Faith, and sincere Obedience, which God by the New Covenant of Grace, accepts unto righteousness, though it be not exactly conformable to

to the Rule of the Law. Others also who acknowledge the Righteousness of Christ purchased by his propitiatory Sacrifice, yet imbrace this distinction, and do think that Gospel obedience concurs with Faith unto our Justification; because God accepts even the defective services of his Children. And they imagin that St. Paul, and St. Peter may be accorded by taking *Faith* in a Figurative sense, when the former speaks of *Justification* by Faith, &c. Gattaker 66, 67.

X C V I.

The grounds they go upon for taking Faith for all Graces, yea for all good works, for the sum total of all Gospel-obedience, are very insufficient; as namely this for one: Because the word *πίστις* signifies both *Incredulity*, and *disobedience*, and *ἀκούω* is opposed to *ταπεινωθήναι* John 3. 36. Therefore Faith (they suppose) imports not only *Belief*, but also *Obedience*.

The strength of that Argument is meer weakness. For, 1. Though a word have two several significations it do's not follow that it is always to be taken in both, or that those two come all to one. 2. It follows not because *πίστις* signifieth either *unbelief*, or *disobedience*, or both; that therefore the word *πίστις* from which it comes, signifieth the two contrary things, being without the privative particle, for though it doth signifie to *obey*, yet no where to *believe*. 3. The word *ἀπίστις* signifieth *pertinaciam non credendi etiam visis, & auditis idoneis documentis, q. d. Impersuasibilitatem* Estius ad, Rom.

21. 30. *Amicus* signifies more than *amicus*, viz. *Qui non tantum non credit sed recta monentibus resistit*. Therefore it will not follow that the word which is of a contrary signification, doth signifie *Faith*, and nothing else, but rather it should signifie an easiness of *Believing*, or of being perswaded, to own the Truths of the Gospel, &c. 4. Neither is there any word as is directly contrary to *amicus* & *amicus* viz. any such word as *amicus*, *amicus*, whereby *Faith*, or a Believer may be signified, &c. Therefore from the notation of these words, no Argument can be drawn that to believe, and to yield sincere Obedience to the whole Gospel are all one, or the same thing.

XCVII.

They who contend for *Faith* being a Complexive word, signifying all sorts of Graces, and the sum total of Gospel Obedience, and of all good works, do pretend that to the best of their understanding. St. Paul and St. James cannot be otherwise reconciled, and for that reason, they are induced to take *Faith* in so large a sense, as that it may include works, &c. Now, that Reason will easily fall to the ground if we can prove that St. Paul and St. James may be fairly accorded without it, as also that they two ought not to be so reconciled.

XCVIII.

XCVIII.

The passages in which St. Paul and St. James seem to some to differ, *in toto Cælo* are these. St. Paul saith, Rom. 3. 28. *We conclude that a man is justified by Faith without the deeds of the Law,* and Rom. 4. 2, 3. *For if Abraham were justified by works, he hath whereof to glory, but not before God. For what saith the Scripture, Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him for Righteousness.* v. 4. *Now, to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of Grace, but of Debt,* v. 5. *But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his Faith is counted for Righteousness,* v. 6. *Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man to whom God imputeth Righteousness without works.* Thus far St. Paul.

Then comes St. James, and saith, Jam. 2. 20. 24. *But wilt thou know, O vain Man, that Faith without works is dead? Was not Abraham our Father justified by works when he had offered Isaac his Son upon the Altar? Seest thou how Faith wrought with his Works, and by Works was his Faith made perfect? And the Scripture was fulfilled, which saith, Abraham believed God, and it was imputed to him for Righteousness, and he was called the Friend of God,* v. 25. *Ye see then, how that by Works, a Man is justified, and not by Faith only.* 25. *Likewise also was not Rahab the Harlot justified by Works when she had received the Messengers, and had sent them another way? For as the Body without the Spirit is dead; so Faith without Works is dead also.*

XCIX.

We shall find there is no need to confound *Faith* and *Works* together, in order to reconciling these two Apostles. For though in words they seem to contradict each other, yet in very deed they do not, yea, cannot, because they do not speak *ad idem*, or *circa idem*, but of different *manners*. For St. Paul discourseth how our *Persons* are justified before God, but St. James, how our *Faith* must be justified before Men. Now, our *Persons* are justified by *Faith*, but our *Faith* by good *works*. They who say these two things, do not thwart one another, more, or less. Zanchy saith, *Fides justificat hominem, opera justificant fidem*.

C.

St. James his business is to prove that a bare Profession, or boasting of Faith, not accompanied with good works, can justify no man, nor assure the World that his Faith is such as will justify him before God. This I make appear from Jam. 2. 14. *What doth it profit my Brethren, if a Man say he hath Faith, and hath not Works?* 2. Because he compareth it with a vain Ostentation of Charity, v. 15, 16, 17. *If a Brother or Sister be naked and destitute of daily food, And one of you say unto them, depart in peace, notwithstanding you give them not those things which are needful to the Body, what doth it profit? Even so Faith, if it have no Works, is dead being alone.* 3. Because he compareth it with the Faith that Devils

Devils have, which being without Works is dead, v. 19. *The Devils also believe, and tremble,* v. 20. *But wilt thou know, O vain Man, that Faith without Works is dead.* 3. But that Faith accompanied with good works doth justify both before God, and Men, he proveth by the Example of *Abraham* when he offered his Son, *Gen. 22. 12.* who nevertheless was long before that time justified by Faith in the sight of God. *Gen. 15. 6.* Therefore these words are not to be understood of his Justification to Eternal Life. Moreover, God saith to *Abraham*, *Gen. 22. 12.* *Now I know that thou fearest God.* For by Faith, and good Works, both Internal, and External, we approve our selves, both to God, and Men. Then as for the following instance of *Rahab*, doubtless she is said to have been justified by Works, in the same way and manner that *Abraham* was, to shew, that not only the Jews which sprung from *Abraham*, but the truly believing Gentiles also, were justified after the same manner that he was.

C I.

It is as true that the Reconciling of St. *Paul*, and St. *James* ought not to be attempted by making *Faith*, and *good works* one, and the same thing; as that it is possible to reconcile them otherwise: I say, it is most certain that we ought not to attempt the Reconciling of those two Apostles, by saying that we are justified both by *Faith*, and by good *Works*, or that *Faith* is the same with all *Gospel Obedience*, be-

cause there is a very great stream, and torrent of Scripture running to the contrary, and expressly excluding good works from having any hand in our Justification. Read at large *Rom.* 3. 20. *Rom.* 4. 6. *Eph.* 2. 8, 9. *Titus* 3. 5. 2 *Cor.* 5. 19. 2 *Tim.* 1. 9. 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. 1 *Cor.* 1. 30. *Jer.* 23. 6. *Rom.* 3. 24, 25. *Rom.* 5. 18, 19. *Gal.* 2. 16. *Rom.* 4. 5. *Rom.* 5. 28.

C II.

No Man is, or can be justified either by works done before Regeneration, nor by works done by him after Regeneration, neither by the works of the *Ceremonial Law*, nor by the works of the *Moral Law*, nor by *Evangelical Obedience* (as such) nor by *Faith*, or the *credere*, as it is a work: I say, by none of all these, nor yet by all these together, can any Man be justified in the sight of God; no, not so much as *Instrumentally*, much less by these as the *Material*, or *Formal Cause* of his Justification, or as the matter of his Righteousness before God, &c. Because the Scripture excludes all sorts of *works*, considered as such, from our having any hand in the Justification of a sinner, and puts that upon *Faith* alone, and upon that but as an *Instrument*, or hand whereby we receive that Righteousness of Christ which alone *doth*, and which only *can* justify us.

CIII.

That the works of the *Ceremonial Law* do not, or cannot concur to the justifying of a sinner, need not to be proved amongst Christians now adayes, sith that Law is well known to have been long since not only *dead*, but *deadly*. *If ye now be circumcised Christ shall profit you nothing*. Whether tends the Epistle to the *Galatians*, but to encounter with those as would make a medley of *Judaism*, and *Christianism*, and urged a necessity of the *Ceremonial Law* upon the Gentile Converts? Against those he proves that neither *Jews*, nor *Gentiles*, are justified by the Covenant made in *Horeb*, but by *Faith* in Christ, according to the Covenant made with *Abraham* 430 years before the Law, *Gal.* 3, 8, 17. And therefore now to seek Righteousness by the works of the Law is to fall from the grace of Christ. *Gattak*, 74.

CIV.

Neither can Men be justified by works of what sort, or Law, soever done in an *unregenerate estate*. The reason is plain, because such works cannot please God. *They that are in the flesh cannot please God. Without faith it is impossible to please God*. Moreover, the Papists themselves do grant that men are not justified by works done before, but only after their *Regeneration*.

CV.

No man is or can be justified by the works of the *Moral Law*, or by works done in observance of the ten Commandments. For St. *Paul* in the Epistle to the *Romans* deals with those who insisted more upon their obedience to the *Moral Law*, (though they did not exclude the observance of the *Ceremonial*) and they would fain establish a righteousness upon their own works performed out of obedience to Gods Commands, *Rom.* 9. 31, 32. & 10. 3.

CVI.

That when *Paul* excludeth Works from any hand in our Justification, he intendeth as well those of the *Moral*, as the *Ceremonial Law* : I prove thus, yea that he argueth principally against works done in conformity to the *Moral Law*, that they have no power to justifie us. For 1. He treateth of the Law by which sinners shall be judged, which is the *Moral Law*, *Rom.* 2. 12. 2. Of the Law that was written in the hearts of the Heathen, yea of all men, *v.* 14. and that the *Ceremonial Law* never was, but the *Moral*. 3. Of that Law which forbad Adultery, and Sacrilege, and by the breaking of which, the *Jews* dishonored God. (who were strict in observing the *Ceremonial Law*) and was not that the *Moral Law* ? *v.* 22, 23. 4. Of the Law by which is the knowledg of sin, *Rom.* 3. 20. now do's not that *Moral Law* make the greatest discovery of sin ? was it not by the *Moral*

ral Law that *Paul* knew *Concupiscence* to be sin, which otherwise he had not known? now the *Apostle* denies *Justification* to be by the works of that *Law* which discoverth sin. 5. He denies *Justification* by the works of the *Law*, which he went about not to abolish, but to establish, *Rom* 3. 31. That must needs be the *Moral Law*, for the *Ceremonial Law* he labored to abolish, and to establish only the *Moral*. 6. He treats of that *Law* which hath said, *Thou shalt not Covet*, *Rom*. 7. 7. and is not that the purport of the tenth *Commandment*? 7. Of that *Law* which curseth every one that continueth not in all that is written therein to do it, *Gal*. 3. 10. and that was the *Moral Law*, witness *Deut*. 27. 26. For there (whence these words *Gal*. 3. are quoted) *Cursed be he that confirmeth not all the words of this Law to do them*, doth bring up the arrear of the *Curses* from *Mount Ebal*, beginning *v*. 15. *Cursed be he that maketh any graven Image, &c*. If the *Law* therefore there mentioned be spoken of as a *Covenant of Works* to them that are under the *Law*, it must needs be meant of the *Moral Law*, for the *Ceremonial Law* was never any part of the *Covenant of Works* made with *Adam* in *Paradise*; for it was not then extant, yea it was a kind of *Typical Gospel*. 8. Of that *Law* which is fulfilled in this, *Thou shalt love thy Neighbour as thy self*, *Rom*. 13. 8, 9. By all these passages it appeareth, that it is the *Moral Law* of which *St. Paul* chiefly treateth, denying that it is possible for any man to be justified by the works thereof.

CVII.

Yea no man can be justified by *Evangelical Works*, or by sincere obedience to the Gospel. I do not well know how to distinguish betwixt obedience to the *Moral Law*, and obedience to the Gospel, sith the *Moral Law*, or ten Commandments, are the Rule of a Gospel Conversation. And indeed the *Moral Law* was published from *Mount Sinai*, and written in Tables of Stone, some hundreds of years after the publication of the Gospel; and as it could not *disannul the Gospel*, so was it added as a clearer, and more legibly written Rule, to those that were under the Gospel, when the characters of the *Innate Law* were scarce to be read. Moreover, If the grace of God which bringeth Salvation (whereby is meant the Gospel) teacheth us to live Righteously, soberly and Godly in this world, do not the ten Commandments teach the same?

CVIII.

But whereas *Faith* and *Repentance* are commonly called by the name of *Gospel-duties* (as *Unbelief*, and *Impenitency* by the name of *Sins against the Gospel*) for this reason it may be, viz. because the *Moral Law* whilst it was in the nature, and quality of a meer *Covenant of Works*, as to *Adam* in *Paradise*, commanded no such thing as that which we call *Faith*, and *Repentance*, and by the *New Covenant* only these two great Duties are discovered, and imposed, I say admitting some distinction betwixt the *Moral Law*,

Law, and the *Law of the Gospel*, upon the account aforesaid, no man is, or can be justified by obedience to the Gospel, or by *Evangelical Works* in that acceptation, that is, by his *Repentance*, nor yet by his *Faith*, or *credere*, as it is a *Work*, but meerly as it is an *Instrument* whereby we receive Christ, and his Righteousness.

CIX.

We are not, nor cannot be justified by *Evangelical Works*, *Evangelically* performed, viz. from a principal of true Grace, and Spiritual life (and not meerly of nature, and free will) therefore not by any works whatsoever, much less by those *Evangelical* works which are so only for the *matter* of them, as external Repentance, or sorrow for sin, that is short of *Godly sorrow* never more to be repented of, or *Common Faith*, short of the Faith of Gods Elect. Was not *Abraham's* Obedience in following God's call out of his Country in Circumcising himself, & his Family, and in offering his only Son *Isaac*, an evident fruit of his *Faith*? (as we are told, *Heb. 11*. By Faith *Abraham* did so, & so) therefore they must needs be *Evangelical* works, *Evangelically* performed, or good works, both for *matter*, and *manner*. And yet St. Paul teacheth (for all this) that *Abraham* was so justified by *Faith*, that his Obedience had no influence upon his Justification, *Rom. 3. 2*. If *Abraham* were justified by works he hath whereof to glory, but not before God, which is an Elliptick speech amounting to thus much. But
Abra-

Abraham hath not wherewith to glory before God, v. 3. For what saith the Scripture? *Abraham* believed God, and it was imputed to him for Righteousness, &c. See also v. 4, & 5. See also *Gal.* 3. 6, 7, 8, 9. If these Heroick Acts of Obedience came not into account for absolving *Abraham* from the guilt of sin, but his Faith on him that justifieth the ungodly, was imputed to him for Righteousness, and indeed long before the Sacrificing of his Son, then the works of Gospel Obedience ought not to be crowded with Faith into the means of our Justification. *Garrak* 76. Who knows not that *David* was a Regenerate Man, a Man after God's own heart, which fulfilled all his will, *Acts* 13. 22? And yet *David* himself did not expect the blessedness of Justification (or Salvation) upon account of his own works, or Gospel Obedience, *Rom.* 4. 6. Even as *David* describeth the Blessedness of the man unto whom God imputeth Righteousness without works. v. 7. Saying, Blessed are they whose Iniquities are forgiven, &c. Plainly intimating that God is reconciled to the World of true Believers, not imputing their transgressions to them, because he imputes unto them the Righteousness of Christ, which needs not our works to assist it, but requires our Faith to receive it.

Read further what *David* saith, *Psal.* 143. 2. and what *St. Paul* saith, *I Cor.* 4. 4.

CX.

That sincere Obedience to the Gospel, and Good works, the Companions and effects of Faith, are not intended by the word *Faith*, and involved therein, when we are said to be justified by *Faith*, as an *Instrument* (or *Instrumentally*) is evident, because then the Apostle's conclusion would run thus, *Rom. 3. 27, 28. Boasting is excluded not by the Law of Works, but by the Law of Faith.* Whereby we mean Obedience, and good Works. Therefore we conclude that a Man is justified by *Faith*, that is, by Obedience, and Good Works, without the works of the Law. Can we imagine that the Apostle who excludes not only obedience to the *Moral Law* (of which he speaks principally, as hath been proved at large) but also the Obedience of *Abraham* (which was an *Evangelical self-denial*) from the power, or ground of Justification, and opposes the way of *Faith* to the way of *Works* in order to *Justification*, did mean by *Faith*, good Works, and intended that we should expound *Faith* by Obedience? Who sees not a violence offered to the Apostle's words, when they are thus distorted from their genuine signification to a Figurative sense? And who sees not that such a way of Arguing appears to be very absurd and self-contradicting?

To say that Works are excluded from Justification not as Works, or pieces of Gospel Obedience, but as supposed by some to be *meritorious*, is a poor evasion that has no truth in it. Because Faith is affirm'd to be a cause of Justification, or to concur to Justification, in that sense that Works are denied so to do; but Faith is not affirmed to be the *meritorious cause* of Justification. Therefore Works are not in that sense denied to be the cause of Justification, when they are opposed to Faith. Works are plainly denied to be the cause of Justification in that sense that Faith is asserted so to be, Rom. 3. 28. Therefore we conclude a man is justified by Faith without the deeds of the Law. But a man is not there said, or intended, to be justified by Faith as a *meritorious cause*. Therefore works are not there excluded from Justification, as pretended to be *meritorious causes* thereof.

CXII.

To be justified by Works, and by *Merits*, seem in the Apostle's sense to be one, and the same thing. Therefore if we are not justified by *merits*, neither are we justified by works. The Apostle seems plainly to assert that if our Justification were by works, we might plead *merit*, that it would not be of grace but of debt, Rom. 4. 4: To him that worketh is the reward reckoned not of grace, but of debt. Therefore they that deny Justification by *merit*, ought to deny Justification by works also. For one, according to St.

Paul

Paul, would necessarily follow upon the other.

CXIII.

To say that good works, if they were owned as one cause of *Justification*, could not pretend to any thing of *merit*, or meritoriousness, because they cannot be performed but by grace, and strength received from God, who must work all our works in us, and for us, is to say nothing to the purpose. For if that were true, *Adam* could not have merited at God's hand had he stood in the state of *Innocency*, because it was God made man righteous, even the first Man, and who indued him with that habitual Grace, and assisted him with that Divine concurrence, which was sufficient to have continued him in that holy, and happy estate in which he was created, and to have advanced him to a better (as is generally held.) But do not the generality of our Divines grant that *Adam* by well using, or improving that stock of Grace which he had received from God, might have merited at God's hands, if not in the strictest sense, yet in a sense sufficiently safe, proper, and allowable?

CXIV.

If God would have rewarded *Adam* not of Grace, but of Debt, in case he had persisted in his innocency, then *Adam*, according to St. *Paul*, might have been said to have merited his reward, in as much as he should have had it upon the account not of believing, but of working, *Rom. 4. 4.* For said he, To him that worketh is the reward not reckoned

~~reckoned of grace but of debt.~~ Now to be rewarded as of debt, and not of grace, is to be rewarded upon the account of *Merit*; or of what God is pleased to own for such.

CXV.

When the Apostle excludeth *Works* from Justifying us, so as *Faith* doth, or being the *Instrument*, or *Condition* of our Justification, he would no where be understood thereby to intend such works as are *perfect* and *faultless*. For 1. He should then exclude those works which are no where to be found, and therefore need not to be excluded: which seems to have been as needless, as a Question which some are said to have put, who disputed upon this problem, whether it were lawful for us to work Miracles? or whether they might lawfully work Miracles? who might have forborn to have queri'd about the lawfulness of using such a power, till they had first had such a power to use. And 2. If it be said that such works are to be found in the conceit and imagination of some men, I answer, it do's not appear that St. *Paul* was contending with that sort of men, or doth in all his *Epistle to the Romans* take notice of men of that opinion in his time. 3. Whereas there were in his time, many pretenders to Justification by *Works*, it seemeth most probable, that they were such who doubted not but God would take their good works as he found them, and for them graciously accept, and justify them, as being the best works they were able to do, though they knew

knew they were attended with some failings, and imperfections. Tho some have found it too easie to them to think that God will justifie them for their sincere, though imperfect obedience; yet it seems a very hard matter for any considerate man (or person worth confuting) to think that nothing of weakness, and imperfection doth cleave to his good works. St. Paul saith of the *Gentiles*, Rom. 1. that their *Consciences did accuse them* (for some things) as well as excuse them in others. 5. When the *Apostle* saith *what the Law cannot do in that it is weak through the flesh*, &c. though he glanceth at the imperfection of our works, yet he seems to bring it in as a thing that was *known*, or needed not to be proved, that our flesh was weak, that is, we in this corrupt state could not do works that are perfectly good, and to give that which he took *pro concesso*, as the reason why the Law could not justifie us, *viz.* because we cannot keep it perfectly, and it can justifie none but them that can. 6. The Apostle in that text seems to take two things for granted, or such as would easily be owned, *viz.* 1. That the *Law* (or *Covenant of works*) could not justifie one that could not keep it perfectly. 2. That man in his fleshly, or fallen state, or since his fall, could not do that. And by those two confessed *Mediums*, or Propositions, he proves this conclusion, *viz.* That the Law could not justifie fallen man. 7. But neither from this text, or any other, doth it appear that St. Paul was troubled with a sort of men who dream'd of their own works, being every

H

way

way perfect, and did make it his business to oppose them, but only such who dream'd of being saved by their own good works, which they thought God would mercifully accept, and justify them for, though they might need grains, or more than grains of allowance.

CXVIII.

Neither are we justified by *Faith* it self, singly, and solely considered, or by the act of believing (or *credere*) as it is a good work, grace, or quality, but meerly as it is that *Instrument*, whereby we receive Christs Righteousness, by which we are justified, or whereby we are united to Christ, and so become partakers of all his benefits. This is evident, 1. Because the Apostle opposeth *Working*, and *Believing*, each to other, or rather, *Believing* to *Working*, in the matter of Justification, *Rom. 4. 5. But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his Faith is counted for Righteousness.* In this case we may say, *Fides qua opus est justificat, non qua opus est.* That Faith which is a good work justifieth, but not as it is a good work, (as they say, *qua viva*, not *qua viva.*) It is by Christ and his Righteousness alone, as ours *Imputatively*, that we are justified, as by the *matter*, and *form* of our Righteousness, and therefore Faith is but the *Instrument of Application*, as laying on is to a Plaister. 'Tis the Plaister that cureth, the laying on is but the applying of it, or the bringing of the sore and the remedy together. If the Question be put, *Who shall be Justified*

Justified? I answer, *Believers*. But if it be put thus, *Why* is a Believer Justified? or whence results the Justification of a Believer? or by what is he justified? I answer, By the Righteousness of Christ applied to him by *Faith*, *Act. 13. By him* (speaking of Christ) *all that believe are justified*. And *Isa. 53. 11. By the knowledg of him shall my righteous Servant* (that is Christ) *justify many*. It is Christ that shall *justify* (and by the Faith or knowledg of himself as only the instrumental cause) because of the words following, *for he shall bear their Iniquities*. It is by *bearing their iniquities*, i. e. by suffering, and satisfying for their iniquities, (for so Christ is said to have borne our sins in his body upon the the Cross when he died for them) that Christ shall justify them who have knowledg of him, or who believe in him. So then it is not their *Believing*, accepted in the place of a perfect Righteousness, for, and by which Christ Justifieth them, but by *bearing their iniquities*, by his own obedience to the death of the Cross, on their behalf. It is not a poor mans acceptance of a great rich Match that doth enrich him, I say, the act of accepting, is not the the thing that doth it, or is the matter of his Estate, but the rich Match which is offered to him, and accepted by him.

There are Miracles in Scripture ascribed to *Faith*, to which Faith could no otherwise concur, than as an *Instrument* engaging the power of God to work such Miracles, or as a *Condition* to which the working of Miracles was promised, *Mat. 16. 17. These signs shall follow them that*
H 2
believe

believe in my name, they shall cast out Devils, speak with new tongues. v. 18. They shall take up Serpents, and if they drink any deadly thing it shall not hurt them. They shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover. We read Heb. 11. 33. of those who through Faith stopped the mouths of Lions, quenched the violence of Fire. v. 35. Received their Dead raised to life again, &c. Faith it self could not do these things, unless it were omnipotent; therefore it could be but the *Instrument*, or *Condition*, by, or upon which the power of God was engaged to do them, which may serve to illustrate what we have in hand. Look how Faith concurr'd to the curing of that Cripple spoken of, Acts 3. 16. *His name, through Faith in his name, hath made this man strong*. In like manner doth it concur to the justifying of a sinner, viz. as a meer applying Instrument, or Condition; by means of which, and with respect to which, the Righteousness of Christ becomes imputed to us, for our Justification. It was the Name, or Power of Christ, which cured that Cripple; so 'tis Christ, and his Righteousness which justifieth a sinner, but then it is through *Faith*, as the *Instrument* receiving, and applying the same.

CXVII.

Faith is a Grace by it self, distinct from fear of God, Love, self denial, &c. and as such, it acteth when it is *instrumental* in Justification, or doth concur thereto, either as an *Instrument*, or a *Condition* (call it either). When the *Apostle* defineth

defineth *Faith*, *Aeb. 11. 1.* saying, *Faith is the substance of things hoped for, and the evidence of things not seen*, he gives that description of that one grace, and not of all the rest. *Faith* and *Charity* are not the same grace; for the *Apostle* saith, *now abideth Faith, Hope, and Charity, these three, but the greatest of these is Charity.* If they be not distinct, how are they called three? or how could *Charity* be said to be the greatest, if *Faith*, *Hope*, and *Charity* be all one? Is the same thing greater than it self at the same time? Moreover, *Faith* shall hereafter be done away, that is swallowed up in *Vision*, but *Charity* never faileth, as the *Apostle* speaketh, *v. 8.* Now that which faileth, and that which shall never fail, cannot be the same. Moreover, *Faith* is said to work by love, which implies, that they are two distinct things. Also, *Faith* is said to be made perfect by love, *i. e.* demonstrated to be perfect, which sheweth it is not the same thing. I might add *Faith*, and *Repentance* are not the same, witness that expression, *Repentance toward God, and Faith in our Lord Jesus Christ.* *Faith* is causal to several other Graces. They differ as causes, and effects, therefore they cannot be the same thing, *ex gr.* *Faith* is the cause of *Christian Patience.* *He that believes maketh not haste, 2 Cor. 4. 16.* For which cause we faint not, there was their *Patience.* Now that *Faith* was the cause of it may be proved by *v. 18.* *While we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen.* Now to be the evidence of things not seen, or to look at and to realize unseen things, is the nature, and work

of *Faith*. *Faith* is spoken of but as one fruit of the Spirit amongst many, *Gal. 5. 22.* where *St. Paul* enumerates *Love, Long suffering, Gentleness, Goodness, Meekness, Temperance, &c.* were these one, and the same, surely they would not be presented to us under so many several names, and denominations, &c. *Faith* is not the name of a Christians whole *Panoply*, or spiritual Armor, but of one piece thereof. That indeed is called the *Shield*, *Eph. 6. 16.* but *Truth the Girdle*. *Righteousness the Breastplate*, and the *Helmet, the hope of Salvation*. In *2 Thes. 1. 4,* are these words, *We glory for your Patience and Faith.* and *2. 3. Your Faith groweth, and your Charity aboundeth.* and in *1 Tim. 1. 5. The end of the Command is Love, out of a pure heart and Faith,* where *Faith* and *Love* are spoken of as two things, *Faith* as the cause, and *Love* as the effect, *Love* out of *Faith*, &c. For fear of tiring you, I shall quote but one text more, to this purpose, *1 Tim. 1. 11. Follow after Righteousness, Godliness, Faith, Love, Patience, Meekness.* Would the Apostle have given so many names to one and the same thing? or do's it not enough appear by their being so constantly spoken of in Scripture as distinct, that they are not the same? That *Justifying Faith* involves all other Graces, and is the name of all Graces in one, cannot at all be prov'd by the Apostle *James* his discourse of Justification by works: For *St. James* doth not mention any particular Grace, but *Works* in general, as externally, and visibly practised. Had he said *Abraham was justified not only by Faith, but also*
by

by Love, self denial, Obedience, &c. there had been some colour for such an Assertion. But now there is none.

CXVIII.

Seeing *Faith* is almost every where else in Scripture taken for a Grace by it's self, distinct from the rest, and other Graces spoken of as distinct one from another, it can at no hand be proved, that where *Faith* is mentioned with reference to *Justification*, or we said to be Justified by, or through Faith, by *Faith* is meant all sorts of Grace, or the whole Chain of Graces, whereas indeed *Faith* is but one link of that Chain.

CXIX.

If *Faith* it's being the only Instrumental cause, or the only condition of Justification cannot be evaded, by saying that by Faith is meant the Gospel, or by Faith is meant *Faith*, and *good works* together; or by *Faith* is meant not one single Grace, but all comprized under that Name: Nor yet by saying that when works are excluded from *Justification*, we must alwayes understand it of works either as *meritorious*, or as *Perfect*, or as *works before Regeneration*, or as works of the *Ceremonial Law* only, or as works of the *Law*, not of the Gospel, or as works *insincere*, and only materially, and extrinsically good: I say, If *works*, as *works* be excluded from Justification, and none of the other evasions will hold water (as hath been shewed)

then we are not justified by our real, inward holiness, or sincere Obedience to the Gospel, but by *Faith* alone, as the only *Instrument* whereby we receive, and apply to our selves the Righteousness of our Saviour, &c. And if our Obedience to the Gospel, though sincere, cannot be proved to be so much as the *Instrument*, or *Condition* of our Justification, much less the matter of our Righteousness before God, or that which in God's Court of Chancery (as they call it) is accepted instead of a perfect Righteousness for our *Justification*, &c.

C X X.

As for the Popish Distinction of a *first* and *second Justification*; to the latter of which they say good works doth concur. I think there is nothing in it that will satisfie any good Protestant, or any rational man of an unprejudiced mind. For by our *first Justification* they do understand our being made Holy, and Godly of unholy, and ungodly. Now, that Protestants do call not *Justification*, but *Sanctification*. By our second Justification they understand our being made of Holy, more Holy, and of Godly, more Godly. This Protestants deny to be truly called *Justification*, and do call it our *growth in Grace*, or progress in *Sanctification*, and doubtless so it is. But for a Persons being really justified more than once, we have no ground or foot steps in Scripture. Therefore though it be a Truth that a Believer by abounding in good works, doth increase in Grace, and Holiness (for

(for repeated Acts do strengthen their respective Habits) yet that by doing good works, they do acquire a *second Justification*, is a most ungrounded notion, and must suppose that either the *first justification* may be lost, and a *second* obtained, and if so, why may there not be twenty *justifications* as well as two? or else that a Believer is not virtually justified from all his sins at once (which our Divines do generally affirm that he is) Now, if there be no *second justification*, the concurrence of good works thereunto, is a notion that falls to the ground. For, *non entis nulla est affectio*.

C X XI.

The denying of Justification to be by our own inherent Righteousness, accepted as if it were perfect, or instead of the perfect Righteousness of the Law, and asserting of Justification to be by the only Righteousness of Jesus Christ apprehended by *Faith* alone, doth greatly tend to keep Sinners humble, and to exclude all boasting (which God aimeth to do) when they shall consider that that whereby they are justified is not in themselves, this being certain that we are more apt to be proud of what is supposed to be in us, than of what is *imputed* to us. As a Debtor hath less to boast of when the payment of his *Surety* is imputed to him for his discharge, than if by his industry he had procured something to pay for himself, although the stock had been freely bestowed on him by the *Surety*. 'Tis evident by the Apostles words, that that can
be

be no true notion of the way of God's justifying a sinner which doth leave any room, or place, or pretence for boasting, *Rom. 4. 2. If Abraham were justified by works, he hath whereof to boast (or glory) q. d.* That is Argument enough to prove that *Abraham* was not Justified by works. He adds as a *minor* proposition or assumption, *But not before God*, meaning, But he had no cause to glory, or to boast before God. *Ergo.* He was not justified by works.

C X X I I.

Our Graces and good works, though from henceforth they should be perfect, and intire, lacking nothing, would not be able to satisfie God for our *Original sin*, and our Actual sins that are *past*, and to discharge us from the guilt of them, for we cannot pay one debt with another, and our best Obedience is a daily debt; much less then can *imperfect* Obedience to the Gospel, though sincere, justifie us, or be the matter of our Righteousness before God.

C X X I I I.

Our Justification is as free to us (though 'twere not so to Christ) as any Pardon ever was to a Traytor. Now, unto a Pardon freely given there is nothing required but the hearty acceptance of it upon the terms of promising to be a Faithful Subject for time to come, or so. Now, though such a Pardon cost a man nothing, and is abundantly sufficient for his discharge, yet must he come and plead this Pardon in open Court,

Court, he must produce it, and insist upon it; before his Judge, in arrest of Judgment, that the Sentence denounced against him may not be Executed. A Traytor that is so acquitted, cannot be said to be acquitted by his willingness to accept of a pardon, or to produce it in Court when obtained (for what Malefactor is not willing to do these two things?) But by the *Pardon* it's self it is that a Traytor is discharged, though he cannot have the benefit of his Pardon, if it be only tendered, unless it be also *accepted*, and pleaded by him. Now, to accept, and plead his Pardon, when nothing else but that is required of him, renders it no less *free*, than if he might have had it without accepting, or at leastwise, without pleading of it. But were he for his *Pardon*, and in order to the procurement thereof, to be a Servant all the dayes of his Life, that would alter the case, and make his *pardon unfree*.

Believing, or *Faith* is the Acceptance of our Pardon upon God's terms, but *justification* by works, resembleth the last instance, *viz.* of one who must work hard all the dayes of his Life, to pay his Debt, or else be cast into Prison, &c.

CXXIV.

In saying that *Faith* is the *Instrumental* cause, or *Condition* of Justification, we ascribe much more to it than if we had called it only *causa sine qua non*. For *causa sine qua non* do's *nihil ponere in esse*, it produceth nothing; no effect doth
neces-

necessarily follow upon it. The poorest begger hath that in him without which no man can be a Prince, *viz.* Humane Nature. For to be a man is a *causa sine qua non*, of being a Prince, yet how far from being a Prince is a poor Begger? Every Virgin that Liv'd in that time when Christ was look'd for, had a *causa sine qua non*, of being the Mother of Christ. For none but a Female, and a Virgin, could be that, yet respective to the decree of God none but the Virgin *Mary* could be that.

But a Condition is such a thing, as when it is performed, produceth a real effect, *viz.* intitleth to the performance of the promise, which was suspended upon it. Also an *Instrumental Cause*, which is such in Fact, or in *facto esse*, produceth the effect. For no man can be said to be the Instrument of doing such a thing untill the thing be done. A cause in *facto esse* supposeth it's effect to be so. For nothing is actually a cause that doth not actually effect something, &c. Faith is so an *Instrument*, and so a *Condition* of Justification that whensoever a sinner believeth he is thereupon justified immediately in the same Instant.

C X X V.

There is no danger in owning Holiness, and good works to be *causa sine quibus non* of Justification, because a *causa sine qua non* is as remote a thing as can be thought of, and do's not at all intitle what in that sense is called a *Cause* to the effect. For the Law of God is a *causa sine qua non*

non of *fin*. For had there been no Law, there had been no transgression. Yea, God himself who can as soon cease to be God, as be the Author of sin, yet may be said to be a *causa sine qua non* of sin in eference to his making of men, and Angels. For had God Created no intelligent Creatures, there could have been no sin; for such Creatures only are capable of sinning. But shall we therefore make God the Author of sin? God forbid.

Privation is a *causa sine qua non* of Generation, yet Philosophers deny it to be a cause truly so called.

One calls *causa sine qua non*, *causam stolidam*, and well he may, for there is little reason to be given why it should be called a cause, sith the Definition of a cause doth not agree to it, *Causa est cujus vires est*. A cause is that by virtue, or means whereof, some other thing is, or is produced. But nothing is produced by virtue of a *causa sine qua non*. There may be a hundred *causæ sine quibus non*, that a man may have of his being a Lord Mayor of London, if he had not been *ens*, or had a being, he could not have been that, without he had a *vegetative soul*, or without he had had a *sensitive soul*, and a *rational soul*, and a *Body* that had not been monstrous, the right shape of a man, without he had Lived in *Europe*, yea, Lived in *England*, yea, Lived in *London*, yea, had been a Free Man of *London*. yea, been possesst of a visible good Estate, &c. (and twenty things more) he could never have been Lord Mayor of London. And yet will

will any man say that any of these things were the *causes* of his being *Lord Mayor* ?

CXXVI.

Yet owning Holiness, and every grace to be (as they are) causes without which there is no Justification, though it doth not advance other Graces to a parity with Faith, or to an equal influence upon the Justification of a sinner, to that which Faith hath yet is an effectual bar (if rightly considered) against *presuming* to live unrighteously, and unholily, upon the account of our being justified by a righteousness without us. For what is any man the better, or what more encouragement hath he to sin, though it be so that we are not justified by every sort of Grace, but by *Faith* alone (as the only *Instrument* where by we apprehend the righteousness of Christ, and the only condition to which the Promise of Justification is made) sith they that say so, do acknowledge that *Repentance*, *Love*, *Self-denial*, and all other Graces, must concur in the *person justified*, though not to his *Justification*; or that we cannot be *justified* without the presence of those, though by these we are not justified, but by *Faith* alone: yea that the person justified cannot be saved without doing of good works, if he hath space of time for them (which the Thief on the Cross had not) no more than a Sum of Money that is due, can be received without giving an *Acquittance* for it, when it is demanded, and insisted on.

CXXVII.

They give the truest, and best account of the Doctrine of Justification, who so state it as neither to deprive God of the glory of his free Grace, nor to deter man from his duty, in point of sincere obedience ; so as *Justification* may not be confounded with *Sanctification* (as by the Papists it is, as if it were the same thing) as consisting in righteousness not imputed, but infused, nor yet *Sanctification* be excluded, and rendered needless by the Doctrine of *Justification* as it is stated, but *Imputed Righteousness* so confined to the use for which it is designed of God, that *Righteousness inherent*, or *implanted* may be owned as indispensably necessary, though not for the same with *Imputed*, yet for other great ends and uses, &c. By taking care of the latter, we shall arm our selves against *Antinomians*, and *Liberines* ; of the former, against *Papists*, and *Soci-nians*, &c. The account we have given of Justification by *Faith* alone, hath to the best of our knowledg, been so stated, and hath therefore a great character of Truth upon it.

CXXVIII.

The asserting of new Terms, Phrases, and Modes of speaking, in so great a Doctrine as that of *Justification*, though nothing but some more accuracy in stating the old Doctrine concerning it were intended, has been, and is, of dangerous consequence, especially when the old terms, and expressions, whereby it hath been

been competently understood formerly, are cri'd down, and exploded. I say it is of dangerous consequence, because men are thereby led to think, that all that which they have heard concerning *Justification* formerly, was false, though the Inventors of these new expressions, they themselves do not think so, or whatsoever they think, by their new Phrases, they lead the people into Fundamental Errors, being deceived themselves, and deceiving others, I say deceiving, and being deceived.

CXXIX.

Mr. Durham, on the *Revelation*, hath a worthy passage to this purpose, p. 236. *We are perswaded (saith he) that the reflecting on many worthy men, the obscuring of the troden path by new Questions, and Objections, the confounding of Readers by proposing, as it were, of a different strain of the Covenant from what formerly hath been Preached, the giving an open door to men to propose new draughts in all things, and that not in expressions only, but also in Fundamental things, shall be more prejudicial to edification, than the bringing forth of this shall be useful: For if by this all the former Doctrines of Justification be enervated, where were we all till now? If it stand so that the followers thereof may attain Heaven, what is the use of this so full a new model, with so much professed danger in, and dissatisfaction with the former? Will it not be welcom to Papists (saith he) to have Protestants speaking in their terms, and homologating them in condemning the former language of the most eminent Reformers?*

CXXX.

CXXX.

The opening of Faiths peculiar concurring for the Application of Christ his Righteousness in the Covenant of Grace, is a business of great use and concernment, &c. into which we may receive some light by considering how, and in what sense, *Faith* is and may be said to be a *Condition of the Covenant of Grace*, or of *Justification*.

CXXXI.

Covenants are either such as meer entering into them doth entitle to the benefits comprehended in them, as in the Marriage-Covenant, entry thereinto intitleth the Wife to the Husband, and all that is his: Sometimes again the Relation must not only be entered, but also the terms thereof actually performed, before there be a right to the thing promised. Thus if *Jacob* Covenant with *Laban* to serve him seven years, that he may Marry his daughter, at the expiration thereof, he enters into the Relation of a Servant presently, but his reward becomes not due till the end of his service: Or if a Master Covenants to make his Servant free at the end of eight years, in case he shall do him good and faithful service, though he be now his Covenant Servant, yet his Freedom, the reward of his Service, will not become due to him till he hath actually serv'd his Master, so many years, &c.

CXX XII.

As there are two sorts of Covenants (as hath been said) so there are two sorts of Conditions of a Covenant, or Covenants: For 1. The words *Condition of a Covenant*, are sometimes taken more largely ; for all the duties that are required of one in that Relation: And so a Wives dutifulness to her Husband after Marriage, may be called Conditions of the *Marriage Covenant*. Sometimes a Condition is taken more strictly, and *Formally* ; that is, for such a thing as makes up the Relation, and entitles one to, and enstates him in the Priviledges Covenanted. So Formal consenting in Marriage is the Condition. And a Sons actual accepting of the assured Adoption, and engaging himself to be dutiful, do enstate him in the priviledge of a Son, although he hath not actually perform'd all that he is engaged to. And in this respect the actual performing of such duties, is rather the duty of one in such a Relation, than the Condition required to the up-making of it.

CXX XIII.

There is difference betwixt the Priviledges, of a Covenant which flow from it ; as such, and to all in such a Relation, (Thus all Wives, as such, have interest in their Husbands) and those Priviledges of a Covenant, which are but conditionally promised even to them that are within those Relations. So what a Husband promiseth to give his Wife upon condition of her being

ing a Faithful Wife, depends not upon her Relation as a Wife, but upon the continuing faithful. An Adopted Son cannot plead actual possession of the Inheritance, though he be a Son, till that time come that was appointed by the Father, or till he perform something call'd for in the right of Adoption, (which is insinuated,) Gal. 4. 1, 2.

CXXXIV.

What hath been said may help to shew us in what sense Works may be called the Condition of the Covenant of Grace, and in what sense Faith only. If we take *Condition* largely, and materially for whatsoever is required of one in Covenant; so Works may be called the Condition of the Covenant. Even as a Wife or Son, their performing Conjugal, or Filial Duties to a Husband, or Father, may be called Conditions of Marriage, and Adoption: Yet if we consider the Condition of the Covenant of grace strictly and *formally*, for that which doth actually interests one in, or entitle him to Christ's Righteousness, and maketh him a son, that is Faith properly taken as it doth unite with Christ Job. 1. 12. because it is impossible to conceive one to believe in Christ but he must be conceived to have title to him, as a Wife to her Husband, or a Son to his Father. And so he cannot be conceived to be a true Believer but he must be justified; because to have interest in Christ, and his Righteousness, cannot be separated from Justification.

CXXXV.

The *Covenant of Grace* is not like the Covenant betwixt a Husbandman and his Labourer, for his hire, which presupposeth working, and so the performance of it must go before the Servant, or Labourer can plead any thing upon the Agreement: But it is like a Marriage Covenant, or *free Adoption*, which doth indeed infer duties to follow in the respect aforesaid, and doth imply an ingagement to perform them, but doth not presuppose the actual performance thereof before any right can be pleaded by such Relations, but only consenting and ingaging to the same. The *Covenant of Works* is in Scripture compared to that Covenant which is betwixt a Master and his hired Labourer; hence the reward is called *Debt*, or *Hire*; because the performing of the Conditions, of Holiness, and Obedience was necessarily presupposed unto having right to the great priviledges of that Covenant. For though *Adam* was in covenant with God at first, yet could he not claim life by virtue thereof, till he had continued in obedience to the commands, and actually performed the same, as Servants must do before they can plead for their hire. Again, The *Covenant of Grace* is compared to *Free Adoption*, and to *Marriage* betwixt Man, and Wife, not because the *Covenant of Grace* requires not Holiness, or Works, but because it doth not require them actually to precede a persons title to all the priviledges Covenanted, and doth freely entitle him to the same

same upon his entery therein, as a Wife is entitled to what is her Husbands upon her Marriage with him, although afterwards she be to perform the Duties of the Relation, rather as duties called for by it, than as *Conditions* of it, &c.

C X X X V I.

The difference betwixt the *Covenant of Works*, and *Covenant of Grace* lieth not in this, that the one requireth Works *perfectly holy*, as the Condition thereof, and the other Evangelical works, not *perfectly holy*: because so there were not the same Law for ordering holiness to us which they had, nor the same absolute pattern of Holiness for our Copy, viz. God's Holiness calling us to *be holy as he is holy*; nor were defects in reference to our perfect Holiness, sinful under the *Covenant of Grace*, if perfection were not required therein; all which are false, beside that so it were still of *works*. But the difference lieth in this, that our *working* is not to be the ground of our Inheritance, nor actually to precede our Righteousness, (as in the *Covenant of works* was necessary) but *believing*, and *consenting* only.

C X X X V I I.

The difference betwixt the *Covenant of Works*, and the *Covenant of Grace*, may be conceived thus: Suppose a Debter Sued for his own Debt should either plead no Debt, or that he had paid it, or would pay it; this is the *Covenant of Works*. Again, the *Covenant of Grace*, is as a

Debtor, acknowledging Debts, but being unable to pay, pleadeth only the Surety's payment, and expecteth to be absolved on that account; and not as if by a Surety's intervening he had had all the Debt forgiven him, to so much, or had a new bargain given him, for a penny yearly, or a Pepper-corn in the place of a thousand Talents; and in a word, so much down, and that for Gold, Oare of Gold should be accepted. For if so, It would be the same kind of Condition, and so the same Covenant in kind. For, *Majus & minus non variant speciem.*

CXXXVIII.

Whereas the Gospel requireth *perfect Obedience* (as hath been proved) as truly as the *Covenant of Works* did, were that *perfect Obedience*, the Condition of it, without which the benefits thereof cannot be enjoyed, there would be no difference at all betwixt the *Covenant of Grace*, and the *Covenant of Works*, forasmuch as both did require *works*, yea and *perfect works* as the condition thereof.

CXXXIX.

It may be farther evidenced, that not sincere, though imperfect Obedience, is the Condition of the *Covenant of Grace*, and of our Justification, but *Faith*, because when the *Apostle* opposeth the Righteousness of Law and Gospel, he opposeth not as it were 1000 Talents to a penny, or one sort of works to another; but the Righteous-

teousness of Christ, or to be found in him to all kind of Works whatsoever, *Phil. 3. 9. 2 Cor. 5. 21. Gal. 3. 12. And to have the Righteousness of Faith, and the Righteousness of Christ, and the Righteousness by Faith, are ever one and the same thing, and are still opposed to Works.*

CXL.

Moreover, the Sinners charge is not this, that he wants his penny, or pepper-corn, but that he hath broken the Law, his Righteousness therefore must be such as doth meet that charge, *Rom. 8. 34.* And so it must be such a Righteousness as may be equivalent, at least to his own fulfilling the Law, or his having satisfied the penalty thereof.

CXLI.

When we say *Faith* is the *Condition* of the New Covenant, and of our *Justification* (which is one great priviledge thereof) we mean, that our having right to God's promises supplyeth that room which *Conditions* do in men's mutual bargains; wherein when one promiseth something on such a Condition, the performance of that Condition doth turn the conditional promise into an absolute right to him that hath performed it. And so *Faith* is the Condition upon which the Title to that great promise, *viz.* God's being our God doth depend. *Faith* hath obtained that Name in respect of the place which God hath put it into in his Covenant, and so it flows from his extrinsick Ordination, *Durham,*

CXLII.

But when *Faith* is called the Instrumental cause of our Justification the intrinsick manner of it's Acting is respected. For though it be from the Spirit, with other Graces, and they be not separated, yet hath it a peculiar aptitude to *look to Christ, receive him, apprehend, and eat him, take hold, and rest on him, &c.* That is, expect Salvation from him, for so the Jews were said to *rest* in the Law who expected *Justification* by it, *Rom. 2.*

CXLIII.

It is a Truth greatly to be observed, that for attaining of *Justification* by Christ's Righteousness, *Faith* doth peculiarly concur in the apprehending thereof, and working thereon, otherwise than other Graces can be said to do, *Durham 240.*

CXLIV.

The fore-going Proposition will not seem strange if we consider, That to be Justified by Christ, and by Faith, or by the Righteousness of Christ, and by the Righteousness of Faith, are still one in Scripture, even then where that concurrence which is allowed to Faith is deny'd to all other things, which sheweth, that Faith concurrerh peculiarly, and that it justifieth by obtaining Justification through Christ. 2. As Faith of Miracles did concur for the obtaining of a particular benefit, so doth saving Faith for
attain-

attaining of Justification. But Faith of Miracles did concur Instrumentally for health; for 'tis said, some had Faith to be healed. *i. e.* to receive virtue from Christ to heal them, which others had not. And accordingly the effects are attributed both to their *Faith*, and to Christ's power. Therefore it may be so here, *viz.* Justification may flow from Faith, as the *Instrumental Cause*, and from Christ's Righteousness as the *Meritorious*.

CXLV.

Works are not the *Instrument*, or *Condition* of our Justification, whether works before Conversion, for they were not acceptable, nor works after Conversion, for they are after *Justification*; and so can be no cause thereof.

CXLVI.

If any shall object and say, that neither Faith before we are Sanctified can Justifie us Instrumentally, nor Faith after we are Sanctified (for the reasons alleaged against Works) I answer, It is neither Faith before, nor after our being Sanctified, or Converted, that is the Instrument of our Justification, but that *Faith* which enters into us into a justified estate, and it cannot be conceived either *before*, or *after*, being an instantaneous Act, as solemn consenting in Marriage is not before, nor after, as it constituteth Marriage, but instantly.

CXLVII.

CXLVII.

Some to make way for Works being a Condition of Justification as well as Faith, do say that Justification is not an instantaneous, but a continued Act: but in the sense they do affirm it is false. For it cannot be said that Believers do continue in being *admitted into* a justified Estate, or that by a continued Act the Lord is still admitting them, as it inferreth *non-admission*, or an imperfect admission, which is the sense in which they affirm it: but all that can truly be said is, that God continueth to *Justifie*, or that the Act of their admission into that Estate is a continuing Act. As a Man is married but once, to one Woman, but though his consent to Marry be given at once, and the same instant they are Man and Wife; yet that an Instantaneous Act of his in declaring his consent to Marry, abideth for ever, as long as they two shall Live.

CXLVIII.

That Justification is no continued Act, I prove thus. 1. A Sinner upon his Believing is instantly justified and freed from the curse, and instated into Friendship with God, *Ergo*. Justification is no continued Act. 2. Our being admitted into the Covenant of Grace as to a right to the saving Blessings promised therein is no continued, but an instantaneous Act. *Ergo*. Justification is so. For they who are so in Covenant are Justified, &c. 3. A Believer is not partly

partly under the Curse, and partly under Grace; partly saved, and partly damn'd; partly absolv'd, and partly condemn'd; therefore being certainly under Grace, and absolution in part, (for else he could not be said to be justified at all) he must be altogether so. 4. A Believer, for that he is such, or as, and as soon as he is such, hath a Righteousness that can abide the Trial in Justice. Therefore Justification cannot be a continued Act. For if the Justification of a Sinner were but a perfecting, it could not be said that he had an Actual, perfect Righteousness (as that of Christ imputed to him is) but only that it were a perfecting.

CXLIX.

To say that Works are a Condition of the Covenant, or of *Justification*, were to confound the *Covenant of Grace*, and the *Covenant of Works*. Now, the Apostle doth directly oppose these. *The Righteousness of the Law saith on this wise, The man that doth these things shall live in them.* And the Righteousness of Faith is holden forth as opposite to that, and so cannot be said to consist in doing of works, *Rom. 10. 5, 6. Gal. 3. 12.* The *Covenant of works* is so called, in respect of the formality of the Condition thereof, *viz. Doing*, that is, the Righteousness which we our selves do, *Titus 3. 5. Not by works of Righteousness which we have done, &c.*

C L.

Faith is opposed to works as the *Condition* of the *Covenant*, or of *Justification* not as considered in it's self, but with Respect to it's object *Christ*. Works inherent in us, and performed by us are call'd for in the *Covenant of works*, as the Righteousness thereof, and as the only ground upon which we can expect to be justified by it. Again, by the *Covenant of Grace* *Christ's Righteousness* without us received by *Faith* is only admitted as a Right and ground of *Justification*. 'Tis evident that *Faith* is so to be understood, *Rom.* 10. 5, 6. *Gal.* 3. 10, 11, 12. For the Righteousness spoken of, *Rom.* 10. 3, 4. (which is the Righteousness of *Faith*, and is opposed to our Righteousness) is *Christ the end of the Law for Righteousness to all that believe*. So it is also, *Gal.* 3. And it is observable that in both these Chapters the difference of the Condition of the *Covenant of Works*, and of *Grace* is insisted, on to plead the necessity of a Righteousness without us in opposition to our own: and so *Faith* must be the Condition of the *Covenant of Grace* as it acteth, or resteth on that.

C L I.

We cannot assent to the distinction which some give, *viz.* That *Christ* is our *Legal Righteousness*, that is, that by him we have satisfied the *Covenant of Works*, he having pay'd in our Name; but *Faith and Obedience* are our
Evan-

Evangelick Righteousness; that is, as he hath procur'd a new grant of Life upon these easie terms, in the Covenant of Grace, and so as by performing thereof we may come to have right to what he hath purchased in satisfying the first Covenant.

CLII.

I say, we cannot assent to the fore-said distinction. 1. Because it doth make two Righteousnesses in Justification, and one of them to be the means for attaining the other, whereas the Gospel Righteousness is but one in it's self, by Faith apprehended and made ours. Christ is our *Legal Righteousness*, as the Law's charge is satisfied by him: and he is our *Evangelick Righteousness*, as the mean of answering the Law is proposed to us in the Gospel, and for us, upon the condition of Faith, accepted by the same, without which Christ had never been our *Legal Righteousness*. But if we consider the *Law righteousness* strictly, as it requireth *Satisfaction* from the very Party, so Christ is not our *Legal Righteousness*, but our *Evangelick Righteousness*, seeing no other way but by the Gospel we have access to him.

CLIII.

To such as do affirm that Christ hath procured Faith (in that large sense as involving Gospel Obedience) to be accepted as our Righteousness, I would answer, 1. That were not to make Christ our immediate Righteousness, but
only

only to procure that such works should be accepted, and the former Covenant mitigated, but not in its Nature changed. 2. That overturneth the *Imputation* of Christ's Righteousness as our immediate Righteousness, and so puts upon being found not in Christ's Righteousness, but in our own, contrary to *Paul, Phil. 3. 9.*

CLIV.

Concerning *Faith*, it is modestly, and safely expressed, that *Faith*, at most, is but the condition on which Christ becomes our Righteousness; and so *Faith* it self properly cannot be our Righteousness. When *Faith* is called the condition of the Covenant, or our Righteousness, it doth not imply that it is properly imputed, but it shews to whom, and upon what terms Christ's Righteousness is imputed, or how a Sinner may have access to be justified by it.

CLV.

Faith when it is called a condition of the covenant ought alwayes to be taken strictly, as it receiveth Christ, and by that manner of Acting is differenced from all other Graces, and Works.

CLVI.

Faith strictly taken cannot be rightly conceiv'd but as looking to Christ's Righteousness, the object thereof, even as we cannot conceive a consent which constituteth a Marriage, without

out respect to the party consented to : or as we cannot conceive looking to the brazen Serpent, as the condition, or mean, by which health was gotten, but with respect to the object thereof, the Serpent, and the ground preceding, *viz.* God's appointment ; without which, a look simply considered was of no such virtue.

CLVII.

To them that shall say, If Faith properly taken be the condition of the *Covenant of Grace*, and hath in that succeeded in the room that works had in the *Covenant of Works*, it therefore must be our *Evangelical* Righteousness ; as *Works* were our *Legal* Righteousness. I answer ; That Faith is never to be taken without implying the Object, Christ, or without respect to it's proper aptitude for receiving him. And so *Believe and thou shalt be saved*, implyeth still this, Receive Christ and rest on his Righteousness, or submit to Christ's Righteousness, and accept of him for that end, that he may be Righteousness to thee, and thou shalt be saved. Our Evangelick Righteousness whereby we are absolved is in Christ, not in our selves, 2 *Cor.* 5. 21. as the sin for which he was sentenced was in us, not in him.

CLVIII.

The disproving of Justification to be a continued Act, plainly proveth Faith and Works joyned together not to be the Condition thereof. For if so, no man could be justified till the close
of

of his life, or till he had persevered in Faith and Holiness to the end of his days. Now if Justification be an *Instantaneous* act (like that of a Judge giving sentence of Absolution) then good works cannot precede our Justification, and consequently not be the Instruments of it. True it is, God continueth to pronounce Believers Justified to their dying day, and the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness unto them never ceaseth as to the virtue of it; but it cannot be said that God doth continue to change Believers from a state of Enmity to a state of Friendship, which is the true notion of Justification.

CLIX.

The way of Justification more clearly expressed under the Gospel by these expressions, *Believe in the Lord Jesus and you shall be saved*, may be somewhat illustrated by comparing it with the Typical expressions under the Law. Now the expressions of the Old Testament run thus: *When a man sinneth he shall bring an Offering, &c. and he shall put his hand upon the head of the Burnt offering, and it shall be accepted for him, to make Atonement for him, &c.* In those words God did propose something as a Righteousness for a sinner, which was to be accepted for him; yet none will say that it was the external Sacrifice it self that was to be accepted for such, nor that it was the Faith of the Offerer alone, that was so accepted: For then there needed no Sacrifice, but it behoved to be the thing Typefied by that Sacrifice, viz. the Sacrifice of Christ
look'd

look'd to by the Faith of the Offerer, that was so accepted. Yet the external Sacrifices in the Old Testament, are as expressly said to be accepted for a sinner's Justification, or an Atonement for him, as Faith is said to be counted for Righteousness in the New. And as it cannot be said that by vertue of Christ's Satisfaction, and the Covenant with him, it was procur'd that such Performances, and Sacrifices, should be accepted of themselves as the person's immediate Evangelical Righteousness: (though their Ceremonial Law was their Gospel) So it cannot be said that there is any such bargain concerning Faith in the New Testament, but that Christ apprehended by Faith is the Righteousness both in the Old, and New Testament, which is the thing that we intend, &c.

CLVI.

A right understanding of the *matter* of our Justification, or of what is the *matter* of our Righteousness before God, will help us to understand both the *Formal*, and *Instrumental cause* thereof. The Matter, or Material Cause of our Justification, is that which answereth to this Question, *What is the very thing which causeth a man to stand righteous before God, and to be accepted to Life everlasting?* We hold that the Satisfaction made by Christ in his Death, and Obedience to the Law, is imputed to us, and becomes our Righteousness. Perkins, p. 58. If then Christ's Satisfaction or Obedience, be the *matter* of our Righteousness before God, it will thence follow, that the

K

Formal

Formal Cause of our Justification must needs be the Imputation of that Righteousness: for by means thereof it is that we are justifi'd from guilt, and accepted to life as effectually as if we were *formally just*, by a perfect Righteousness inherent in us: that imputation with reference to the fruits, and effects thereof, is as it were a *formal inherent Righteousness: i.e.* as beneficial to us as if it were such. Hence also may the *Instrumental* cause of Justification be gathered, and found out; viz. *Faith*. Because that is the true Instrument of Justification, by means of which, or by, and upon which, the Righteousness of Christ becomes imputed to us, and that is *Faith* alone. Faith is all in all for matter of receiving the Righteousness of Christ; for that Grace which receiveth Christ, is that Grace which we call *Faith*: And when the Righteousness of Christ is once received, the sinner is Justified, there is no more go's to the justifying of him. As there go'es no more to the sealing, or stamping of Wax, than its receiving the Impression of the Seal that is put upon it, when that is done it is Sealed.

CLXI.

Nothing can justify us Instrumentally, but what can instrumentally procure the acquitting of us from our sins, or the application of such a Righteousness to us as whereby we may be acquitted from all our sins. *Works*, as *Works*, cannot do that, but *Faith* can: Therefore not *Works*, but *Faith* are the Instrument of our Justification. This is the great Argument which
St.

St. Paul insists upon in his three first Chapters to the *Romans* to make way for the Conclusion which he draws up, *Rom. 3. 20. viz.* that we are justified by Faith, and not by the Deeds of the Law; *viz.* because all are sinners, both *Jews*, and *Gentiles*, and it is not their after-obedience to the Law of God that can satisfy for their former sin, and disobedience: neither can any thing justify us that cannot acquit us from our by-past sins, or satisfy for them, only Christ's Obedience, and not ours, can do that, and that Obedience of our Saviour is apprehended by Faith alone; I say the Righteousness of Christ is received only by *Faith*, and not by *Works*: because Works, or Gospel obedience, are not the Condition of our Justification, as not preceding, but following it: neither is it by them, but by Faith, that Christ and his Righteousness are received; forasmuch as whatsoever it is that receives, or accepteth of Christ his Righteousness, as offered in the Gospel, that is called *Faith*, and intended by the word *Faith*, &c.

CLXII.

If men mistake themselves in the great point of Justification, they may not, yea cannot justly extenuate their fault by charging St. Paul's Discourses, and Arguments about it, with great *obscurity*, and that the strength, and force of them, is at leastwise very much concealed, and latent: Witness what that great man, Mr. *Gattaker* saith, (quoting also a greater man than himself, *viz. Jo. Picus, Count. of Mirandula.*) His words

are these: Nor do I conceive this (Epistle to the Romans) to have gained precedency (he means as being placed first) so much in regard of the preheminance of the place to which it was written, being at that time the head City of the Roman Empire, but principally rather in regard of the eminency, and excellency, yea deep profoundity of the Mysteries of the Gospel, more fully, and largely therein delivered, than in any other of them, I may boldly say, what if I should say in all the rest of them were they all put together? Add we may hereunto, that the points herein discoursed, and debated, are pursued, and prosecuted with that nervosity of Argument, and vivacity of Spirit, and the limbs and joints of the whole discourse so aptly knit together, and artificially riveted into one another, that that Noble Italian Earl, so much renowned for his variety of Learning, sharpness of Insight, and soundness of Judgment, that he was deemed the Miracle of the Age he lived in, is reported to have said; That all the Humane Writings of Learned Men, and great Scholars, that ever he had seen, or read, seemed to him in comparison of this one our Apostle's Master piece (as he esteem'd it) *Tanquam scopæ dissolutæ* (as it is in the Proverb) but as Besomes without bands. Gattaker 2.

CLXIII.

If what has been said and proved touching the great Doctrine of Justification as I have stated it be true, there are many Errors in Mr. Sherlock's Book, relating to that excellent Doctrine: and if such be the true causes of Justification

tion as I have assigned, the causes assigned by Mr. *Sherlock* are not the true. I presume he did not foresee the many ill Consequences which would follow upon his denying *Imputed Righteousness*, and myriads of absurdities, that would insue thereupon; but the Error it self is nevertheless chargeable, as followeth.

CLXIV.

Whereas I have asserted, and prov'd, that God is the Principal *efficient* of Justification, or that it is God who justifieth; Mr. *Sh.* Tenet (I do not say he himself thinketh so) saith, that He who is justified, justifieth himself. He justifieth us, whose *Righteousness* justifieth us: but according to Mr. *Sh.* our own Righteousness, or sincere Obedience to the Gospel justifieth us, *Ergo*, we justify our selves. Wherefore is God said to justify sinners, but because he provides and imputes a Righteousness whereby they are justified? If then the Righteousness whereby we are justified be of our own providing, and procuring, as it is, if obedience to the Gospel be that Righteousness, then do we justify our selves. As *Adam* in case he had stood might and would have been said to have preserv'd himself in a happy condition, though God gave him at the first the grace and power whereby to do it. So though that power whereby we are enabled to obey the Gospel do come from God, yet may we be said (as well as he in the other place) by the improvement thereof to justify our selves, or to do that whereby we are justified,

CLXV.

Yea, in case we were justified by our obedience to the Gospel, in opposition to any imputed Righteousness, then do we not only justify our selves, but justify our selves upon higher terms, and in a more noble way than others say that God himself doth justify sinners; viz. by way of *Inherency*, or of *Inherent Righteousness*, which is more honorable to us, and denominates us (strictly speaking) more just, than that Righteousness for which we must be beholden to another.

CLXVI.

Mr. *Sherlock's* Tenet, or his denying of Imputed Righteousness, overthroweth, in the next place, the *Proegoumenal*, or inward moving cause of Justification, viz. the free Love, Mercy, Grace, and good will of God, which we say did from within stir him up thereunto. But if Believers have a Righteousness Inherent in themselves that is able to justify them, and God too in accepting it as such, (as Mr. *Sh.* saith, we are justified by our sincere obedience to the Gospel) then not meer free Grace, ~~and good will~~, and good will, but the Justice, and Righteousness of God's nature, who did foresee that we would in due time obey the Gospel, did move him from Eternity to decree, and in time to effect our Justification: For look what did move God to accomplish our Justification in time, did move him to decree it from Eternity.

CLXVII.

CLXVII.

Moreover, Mr. *Sh.* Tenet overthroweth the true *Procatartick* or external moving cause of our Justification, or denieth it so to be. Now that cause say we is Christ; but Mr. *Sh.* or rather his Tenet, saith, that foreseen good Works, or Obedience to the Gospel was that cause. For look by what we are Justified principally, by that it is that God was externally (or from without) moved to justifie us. But according to Mr. *Sh.* we are Justified by our own Inherent Holiness principally; viz. as by the matter, and form of our Righteousness before God: *Er-gr.* The contrary to this see in a former Thesis.

CLXVIII.

Again, Mr. *Sherlock's* Tenet overthroweth, and denieth that *Instrumental Cause* of Justification, which we have assigned, and proved, viz. *Faith*, and Faith alone. For if we are Justified by a Righteousness of our own, we need not Faith to lay hold upon that Righteousness: surely we are not justified by believing in our selves, or in our own Righteousness. If we are Justified by *Gospel Obedience* principally, there needs no Faith to Justifie us *Instrumentally*: But if we say by Gospel Obedience only *Instrumentally*, then he advanceth every Grace, and all sorts of good Works to as great an interest in the Justifying of a Sinner, as Faith it self hath, which hath been disproved.

CLXIX.

Mr. *Sherlock's* Tenet assigneth that for the *matter* or *material cause* of our Justification, which I have clearly proved is not, *viz.* our own Righteousness, or Obedience to the Gospel. If a Righteousness that is *Imputed* be not the matter of our Righteousness before God, as he saith it is not, then our Inherent Righteousness must; for we must be justified by some Righteousness or other; and every Righteousness must consist of something, and that whereof it consists is called the matter, or material cause of it: *i. e.* Gospel obedience is the very thing which causeth a man to stand righteous before God, and to be accepted to life everlasting. Now that it is not so (besides what hath been said already to the contrary) I prove thus; *viz.* To justify a sinner, is to declare him guiltless, and faultless, as being really so, for that by his Surety he hath satisfied for all his Trespases. But God cannot declare a sinner guiltless, and faultless, and one who has satisfied the Law, by, and upon the account of his own Inherent, and Imperfect Obedience: For then should the Judgment of God not be according to Truth. Again, Whereas Justification doth involve Remission of sins as a necessary effect from that cause (for to remit sin is not to punish it eternally, and God cannot punish their sins, whom he hath declared to have satisfied his Justice by Christ, so as to exempt them from eternal punishment) only that Righteousness can be said to justify us, which

which is sufficient to procure the Remission of our sins, or we can be justified only by that Righteousness, by, or by means whereof our sins are pardoned: but our sins are not pardoned by, or for our Inherent, but Christ's Imputed Righteousness. *Ergo*. I might add one Argument more. We are justified by the Righteousness of *but one*, *Rom. 5*. But inherent Righteousness, or Gospel Obedience is the Righteousness of *many*, yea, of every one who believeth; I mean their own Righteousness: *Subjective Ergo*, we are not justified thereby.

CLXX.

Mr. *Sherlock's* Opinion destroyeth the *Formal Cause* of Justification, which if the Righteousness, or Satisfaction of Christ, be the *material* cause of Justification (as hath been proved) can be nothing else but the *Imputation* of that Righteousness. For as a man is *formally* wise by the wisdom that is inherent in him, so are all Believers as graciously treated by God in reference unto being accepted to eternal Life, upon account of the Righteousness of Christ *imputed* to them, as if they were *formally*, and *inherently* Righteous. To speak strictly, no man hath any *Formal* Righteousness in this Life, that is perfect, for what is *formal* is inherent, but the Righteousness of Christ is as beneficial to Believers to save them from Hell, and bring them to Heaven, as if it were *formally* in them, and therefore it is called the *Formal Cause* of their Justification, as supplying the

the room of such a cause. If by the Righteousness of Christ alone, I am justified, and if the Righteousness of Christ is, and can be made, as it were, *formally* mine (or as good for my purpose) by the *Imputing* of it, then the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness is the *Formal* cause of my Justification; which Mr. Sh. denies, and needs he must, sith he denies that there is any such thing as *Imputation of Righteousness*, &c. But that there is hath been proved at large.

CLXXI.

Yea, one of the chief *Final Causes* of God's Justifying a Sinner, will fall to the ground if we are Justified (as Mr. Sh. saith we are) by our own inherent Righteousness, or Gospel-Obedience; namely, the glorifying of the Riches, and *Freeness* of the *Grace* of God in the Justification and Salvation of Sinners.

Because to be justified by Works, and by *Grace* are inconsistent according to that Text, *Rom. II. 6. If by Grace, then 'tis no more of works; otherwise Grace is no more Grace.* But if it be of works, then *it is no more works; otherwise work is no more work.*

CLXXII.

That Opinion which overthroweth all, and every the causes of Justification commonly assigned by the whole stream of Orthodox Divines (as Mr. *Sherlock's* Opinion denying Imputed Righteousness hath been proved to do)
must

must needs have a very suspicious and dangerous aspect, and look like a thing to be hated, *Cane & Angue pejus*. (as they say.)

CLXXIII.

If by what has been said to weaken Mr. *Sherlock's* Opinion against *Imputed* Righteousness, and to strengthen our own for it, it appeareth (as I hope it plainly doth) that there is such a thing as *Imputed Righteousness* (that hated name, that great Eye-sore of some Men) then two Corollaries will follow thereupon, *viz.*

CLXXIV.

I say, it will follow in the first place, that *Justification* and *Sanctification* are two distinct things; or that Sinners are not justified by a Righteousness *infused*, or *implanted*.

CLXXV.

Secondly, That it is Time and Labour mispent to go about to invalidate, and enervate all those places of Scripture which are commonly brought to prove the Doctrine of Imputed Righteousness, as Mr. *Sh.* hath done. For if there be such a thing, surely the places which he would otherwise interpret, are as fair for it as any.

CLXXVI.

CLXXVI.

Yet it doth not follow, that because good works, Holiness, or Gospel-Obedience, are neither the *Efficient, Instrumental, Material, or Formal Cause* of our Justification, that therefore they are not more, or less concerned with, and about the compleat Formal and Actual justifying of a sinner, or application of his justification to him, or it with them. Certainly other Graces, and Holy Habits besides *Faith* are concerned as *cause sine quibus non* of *Justification*. For no man can be justified that do's not love God, and fear God, and Obey God, &c. because the Justifying Faith is alwayes accompanied with these things, as Life in the Body is with Breath, and inward motion of the heart and blood, &c. though Faith be the only Grace which receiveth that Righteousness of Christ by which we are justified.) Moreover, in order unto being *formally and Actually pardoned*, those great sins which we omit after Conversion, it is necessary for us to *Repent*, and to *forgive* others, their Trespases against us, to make satisfaction to men for injuries done to them, &c. These are Conditions upon which Actual, Formal, compleat Pardon are suspended; yea, and to which it is promised. Moreover, whatsoever may be pleaded as a sufficient ground and motive, upon which a man may be cleared from his sins, may be said to justify him (so works *justifie*, *Jam. 2. 22.* and words, *Mat. 12. 37.*) as evidences that are produced to manifest

manifest Innocency, *Gattak.* 80. Ministers in a remote sense may be said to justify, *Dan.* 12.3. viz. As instruments to bring others to Faith, and so to Justification.

But when we say that we are not justified by good works, or Gospel-Obedience, we mean, as if they were so, and in such sense our Righteousness under the *Covenant of Grace*, as perfect personal Obedience should have been under the *Covenant of Works*, and as if upon their account, and for their sakes, it were that we are delivered from Hell, and accepted to Eternal Life, which I say is only for Christ's sake, and upon his account, who hath purchased Eternal life for us, which as to us is a meer gift.

CLXXVII.

Admit of the Doctrine of Justification by Works as much as by Faith, or as being the same thing with Faith, and the Doctrine of Justification by Merit cannot be excluded, but will first steal in insensibly, and afterwards come to be owned. For if we are not justified by Grace then by Merit; and if by Works, then not by Grace, Ergo. If by works, then by merit, or of Debt, which is all one, *Rom.* 4. To him that worketh is the reward of Debt; and *Rom.* 11. 8. If it be of Works, 'tis no more of Grace.

CLXXVIII.

CLXXVIII.

They do very ill Service to the Church of God in *England*, who at such a time when the Papists are conceived to be wrestling a fall with us for all (and therefore should have less granted them than before, and no more than is just, and fit) do give to them more than ever was given them by Protestants, viz. the Doctrine of Justification by *Works*, and in effect by *Merits*, &c.

CXXIX.

The Persons with whom Mr. *Sh.* Symbolizeth in denying Imputed Righteousness, and pleading for Justification by our sincere, though imperfect, Obedience to the Gospel, are two bad sorts of Men, as most are, viz. *Socinians*, and *Papists*.

CLXXX.

It were easie to reckon up several other things wherein Mr. *Sh.* Socinianizeth, or consenteth with the *Socinians* as such, *Ex. gr.* 1. *In Deo non esse Essentialem Justitiam punientem necessario peccata.* Peltius, p. 12. 2. *Nos non peccasse in Adamo.* Pel. p. 45. 3. *Homines non ita corruptos aut impotentes esse ad bonum vi lapsus Ade.* Pelt. 48. 4. *Posse aliquos ita a peccatis actualibus abstinere ut opera legis perfecte præstent* Pelt. p. 77. 5. *Patres V. Testam. non esse justificados & servatos per eandem viam qua nos nimirum per fidem in Christum, aut per Christum, &c.*
Pel. p.

P. p. 114. 6. *Deus potuit satisfieri alio modo quam per Christi Obedientiam.* Pelt. p. 141. I say, it were easie to reckon up several things of great moment, as to which Mr. Sh. consenteth with *Socinians*, but that which is to our present purpose is that he Symbolizeth with that dangerous sort of men in several points relating to *Justification.* *Ex. gr.* 1. They hold that Christ his Righteousness is not ours, or is not imputed to us for our Righteousness before God: P. 148. 2. That *id credere*, or Faith it's self (as a Grace or Work) is imputed to us for Righteousness. P. p. 151. 3. That Obedience to the Commands is our Justification, or that we are Justified by works. P. p. 156.

N. B. I do not say that Mr. Sh. hath vented the Second, Third, and Fourth *Socinian* errors above mentioned, (in Latine) in words at length, but the passages of a Sermon of his, quoted in my *Prodromus* bring him under vehement suspicion of all those three.

CLXX XI.

Mr. Sh. by denying the Imputation of Christ his Righteousness, doth (though it may be he sees it not) in effect deny the *Satisfaction of Christ*, and in so doing strike hands with the dangerous *Socinians*, in one of their most dangerous, and Characteristical Tenets, and cast in his Lot amongst them. For how can any man be the better for the payment, or Satisfaction which is made by another, unless it be reckoned to

to him, or put to his account, or done, and accepted on his behalf? Which is all one with being *Imputed*.

CLXXXII.

The Second sort of men with whom Mr. *Sh.* Symbolizeth in his Notions about Justification, are our good Friends the *Papists*, with whom Protestants formerly had wont to have the greatest and most frequent contests, and no greater about any point than the Doctrine of *Justification*.

CLXXXIII.

Whereas the *Papists* say, that Justification is not by *Imputation*, but by *Infusion* of Righteousness, Mr. *Sh.* saith both.

CLXXXIV.

That we are not Justified by imputed Righteousness; yea, that there is no such thing, Mr. *Sh.* hath said over, and over again as plainly as words can express it. Witness p. 234. where he saith, that *Christ Righteousness* was not an *imaginary*, *imputed Righteousness*, intimating that *Imputed Righteousness* is meerly *Imaginary*; and in p. 242. Mr. *Sh.* saith, that *Imputed Righteousness* doth plainly contradict the Doctrine of our Saviour, and if the Apostles had taught any such thing as that, it would very much have weakened their Credit with me, for this had been to Preach another Gospel than our Saviour did. And in p. 273. he saith, *The Truth is the Righteousness*

eousness of the Law, and of works in the New Testament signifies only an external Righteousness; which cannot please God; and that internal Holiness, which they call the Righteousness of the Law, is that very Righteousness of Faith which the Gospel commands, and which God approves, and rewards, and this Imputed Righteousness is no where to be found, as I know of, but in their own fancies. Sh. p. 273. Moreover, he labourerth to enervate, by giving a different sense thereof, all those texts both in the Old, and New Testament, which are commonly brought to prove Imputed righteousness, *ex gr.* Jer. 23. 6. Isa. 45. 24. Phil. 3. 8, 9. Rom. 10. 4. p. 271. 1 Cor. 1. 20. p. 272. and in p. 276. he saith, Thus you see that there is no foundation in Scripture for all this talk of a Personal Righteousness of Christ inherent in him; and imputed to us.

CLXXXV.

Whereas Mr. Sh. laieth great stress upon this Argument, viz. that, In all the Histories of the Gospel which give us an account of our Saviour's Sermons, and Parables, whereby he instructed the People in all necessary Truths, he makes no mention at all of the Imputation of his Righteousness to them, but exacts from them a Righteousness of their own if they would find mercy with God. Sh. p. 239, &c. I say, whereas he laieth so much stress upon that Argument, that he intimaterh, that if the Apostles, or if an Angel from Heaven had preached, and published Justification by Imputed Righteousness, he would scarce have believed it. p. 242. (an un-
L
toward

toward expression, sith there is nothing in it contrary to any part of our Saviour's Doctrine.) forasmuch as he meets not with it in any of Christ's Sermons.

CLXXXVI.

The strength of that Argument, *viz.* that because the expression of *Imputed Righteousness*, or *Imputation of Christ his Righteousness* do's not occur, in so many words, in all, or any of our Saviour's Sermons, or Parables, that there is no truth or reality in it, or that there is no such thing: I say the strength thereof is but weakness, (though it seem to be the first-born of Mr. *Sherlock's* strength, as to this matter.)

CLXXXVII.

That the strength of such an Argument as that is but weakness, I affirm, First upon this ground, Because there might be sufficient reason for our Saviour to omit the Preaching of some great, and considerable Truths, as namely because they were known, and believed before. As some things that are plain in the light of Nature, the Scripture saith little of, and the New Testament saith little or nothing, of those things which were plainly revealed before in the Old. Now that the Justification of a sinner should be by the Righteousness, Suffering, and Satisfaction of the *Messias*, was plainly revealed in the Old Testament, *ex gr.* Isa. 53. 11. *By his knowledge shall my Righteous Servant justify many, for he shall bear their iniquities.* And v. 5. *He was wounded*

wounded for our Transgressions, the chastisements of our peace were upon him, and by his stripes we are healed. v. 6. All we like sheep have gone astray, and God hath laid on him the iniquity of us all, &c. Dan. 12. 24. Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people to finish the transgressions, and to make an end of sins, to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting Righteousness, &c. The whole Ceremonial Law, or the greatest part of it (which was a kind of visible Gospel) did continually preach this Truth, viz. that the delivering of us from punishment, and accepting of us to life, and favor with God, was to be upon the account of another, the innocent suffering for the nocent, &c. What else was meant by all the bloody Sacrifices offered for the sins of the people, in which God accepted the life of a harmless spotless Lamb, as a ransom for the life of a spotted, guilty sinner? all these things typifying, and pointing out, that without blood there could be no Remission of sins. Dan. 9. 26. The *Messias* shall be cut off, but not for himself. If then there were a sufficient Light shining in the Old Testament, in *Moses*, and the Prophets, to discover that the Justification of a Sinner, or his being pardoned and accepted with God; was, and always should be by means of another: and particularly by the sufferings of another; and that a harmless, unspotted person; and that the *Messias* was he that should suffer for our sins, *Isa.* 53. 8. He was cut off out of the land of the living, for the Transgression of my people was he stricken. v. 10. When thou shalt make his soul an offering

offering for sin, he shall see his seed, &c. and the pleasure of the Lord (which is the Salvation of Souls) shall prosper in his hands. v. 12, He bare the sins of many, and made intercession for transgressors, &c. What expressions can be plainer than these? These things considered, our Saviour needed not to insist much upon Justification, and Salvation by the righteousness and sufferings of the Messias, sith so much had been said of that by the Prophets of the Old Testament. And if it be said that the Disciples of Christ, nevertheless were very ignorant of the intended death of Christ, witness *Peter*, who said, *Master, these things shall not happen to thee*, when Christ foretold his death, yet our Saviour might not think fit to enlarge much, and often upon that subject, lest his Disciples should not be able to bear the thoughts of it, like an indulgent tender Wife, that cannot bear to hear much said of her Husbands dying, before her self. See *John 16. 12.*

CLXXXVIII.

If from a total silence concerning Imputed Righteousness in all the four Gospels we could not have gathered any such thing (because there might be good reason for saying nothing of it) much less can we safely conclude there is no such thing merely from its not being mentioned there in so many words, as long as we find other expressions, and passages in these texts; viz. in the Histories, Sermons, and Parables of Christ, which are *Tanamount*, or which do necessarily

cessarily imply our being Justified by the righteousness, or Obedience, by the Death and Sufferings of another. Do's not our Saviour say, *John 6. 5. If any man eat of this bread he shall live for ever, and the bread which I shall give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the whole world.* Did not the Voice from Heaven say, *This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased?* intimating that we are made accepted to God by Christ, and upon his account. Do's not Christ say, *This is my blood of the New Testament which is shed for the Remission of sins?* intimating that the pardon of our sins, upon which a title to eternal life necessarily insueth, (for what then can hinder us ?) is upon the account of the blood of Christ, shed for us, which is the thing that we chiefly mean by that righteousness of Christ which is imputed to Believers; viz. his Obedience to the death of the Cross, &c. (which was an act of righteousness in Christ for that he had promised it, and his so doing was in pursuance, and performance of his Promise, &c.) *I come to do thy will, O God, as it is written of me in the volume of thy book.* It was indeed both the effect of righteousness in Christ, and it is the cause of righteousness in Believers: for upon that account are they accepted of God righteous to eternal life, and therefore may well be call'd the righteousness of Christ. According as some excellent Divines expound that text, *John 16. 10. He (speaking of the Spirit,) shall convince the world of righteousness, because I go to the Father, and you see me no more.* It makes greatly

for *Imputed Righteousness*. For say they, the meaning of these words is this, The world shall be convinced that Jesus Christ hath satisfied the Justice of God to the utmost, for that he should maintain his standing in Heaven, and they should see him upon earth no more: whereas, if he had left any part of the debt unpaid, or had not fulfilled all righteousness, he should have been sent back again to the earth whence he came, whereas contrary to that the Scripture saith, that as *Christ died for our sins, viz. to pay our debt, so he rose again for our Justification; viz. to manifest he was fully acquitted from all that was imputed to him, and should appear the second time without sin, &c.* Were the *Israelites* that had been stung with fiery Serpents, cured by a meer act of vision, or looking simply considered, or were they not cured principally by the virtue that was in the Brazen Serpent? It was the Brazen Serpent that cured them, and not they themselves? Now Christ saith plainly, *Joh. 3. 16. As Moses lifted up the Serpent in the Wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up: (viz. upon the Cross) That whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life.* It was by Christ Crucified that Believers were to have eternal life: and if so, then the Obedience of Christ to the death of the Cross, was, and is imputed to Believers; else how come they to have such benefit thereby? If it were not reckoned that Christ suffered in their stead, to satisfy for their sins, or as their *Surety*, whose payment was, and is accepted of God

for

for them, &c. What mean those words of Christ, *John 10. 15. I lay down my life for the sheep?* if the laying down his life be not imputed, or reckoned to his sheep, or accepted on their behalf as a Propitiation for their sins? Do we not read in *Luke 2. 68, 74.* of God's redeeming his people by Christ, and raising up a horn of Salvation for them in the house of David; *As he spake by the mouth of his Prophets, which have been since the world began: That he would grant unto us, that we being delivered out of the hand of our enemies, might serve him without fear.* Now could all this be done without satisfying Divine Justice for sins, since God did insist upon having satisfaction; for *without blood there is no remission of sins:* and the High priest was inspir'd when he said, *It was necessary that one should die for the people.* Do we not read, *John 1. 29.* these words applyed to Christ, *Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sins of the world.* How did he do that but by being slain for the sins of the world? Now if his death, and slaughter, be not imputed, or reckoned to us, we shall be never the better for it. So also, *John 3. 16. God so loved the world that he gave his only Son, that whosoever believeth on him might have eternal life.* So then Christ as given, viz. to be crucified, and delivered up to death for us, is the principal cause of our escaping Hell, or attaining eternal life; to both which Justification entitleth us. Now how should our title to deliverance from Hell, and to the enjoyment of eternal life, result from thence, if Christ dying upon the Cross were not

imputed, or reckoned by God to us, as if we had made satisfaction to his justice, since Christ our Surety hath done it to the full? To conclude with those Sacramental words of our Saviour, *This is my body which was broken for you*. If the breaking of Christ's body be not imputed, or reckoned to us as a satisfaction made for us, or in our behalf, and so accepted of the Father, I see not how his body was broken for us, &c. Sith then all the forementioned places (and it is like several others in the Gospels) do hold forth the sum, and substance of what we intend by *Imputed Righteousness*, though not assert it Syllabically, or in so many words, it can be no just exception against that Doctrine its being a truth.

CLXXXIX.

Another thing in which Mr. *Sh.* symbolizeth with *Papists* is, in that he averreth Justification to be by *Inherent*, or by our own internal Righteousness, as they do, thereby confounding *Justification*, and *Sanctification*, and turning the *Covenant of Grace* into a *Covenant of Works*; or making these two Covenants (which are specifically distinct,) to differ only *secundum magis & minus*. For according to him, we are justified by our obedience to the Gospel; and what is that but the effect of Grace infused, or the acting, and putting forth of inherent Grace, or if you please, our own improvement of that Talent of Grace which God hath bestowed upon us, and consequently, as I said before, we may
be

be said to justify our selves, upon as good reason as it is said, *He that hath this hope in him purifieth himself, &c.* 1 John 3. 3. or as it is said, *Seeing ye have purified your selves in obeying the Truth,* 1 Pet. 1.

C X C.

Mr. *Sh.* so as he stateth the Doctrine of Justification, asserteth that which doth infer *Merit*. I say, he contendeth for that from whence the abhorred Doctrine of Justification by our own *Merits* may be inferred; and would certainly follow to be true, if that which he saith were true. For he sticks not to own Justification to be by our own Evangelical Works; or that we are justified by our sincere obedience to the Laws of Christ *Now to him that worketh is the reward imputed of debt*, saith the Apostle, *Rom. 4.* Now to be rewarded of *Debt*, and that debt for our Work, is all one as to be rewarded of, or upon *Merit*.

C X C I.

Again, the *Papists* do say, that the Formal Cause of Justification is Inherent Righteousness; that is, that by our obedience to the Gospel of Christ we are made, or do become formally just, in the sight of God, and righteous to eternal life. Now Mr. *Sh.* saith no less in substance, if not in words. Now whether it be more safe to say (as all sound Protestants have done) that the imputation of our Saviour's Obedience, and Satisfaction, and Righteousness to Believers
is

is that which justifieth them, that is, freeth them from guilt, and wrath; and entitleth them Righteous to Eternal Life, as effectually as if they were formally just by a perfect inherent Righteousness of their own; I say, whether it be safer to say so, or to say (as Papists do) that the only Righteousness whereby we can be said to be Righteous before God, and whereby we are freed from Hell, and accepted to Eternal Life, is the Righteousness of *Grace*, and *Holiness* implanted in us, and of good works, the Fruits and Effects thereof, &c. Let all Protestants, and impartial Christians judge. How dangerous it is to say, as *Bellarmin* doth on *Rom.* 3.24. *Justificamur per gratiam, i.e. per justitiam ab illo donatam & infusam hac est causa formalis justificationis nostrae.*

CXCII.

It were easie to charge Mr. *Sherlock's* Book with several other things, wherein it harmonieth with our Popish Adversaries in the Doctrine of Justification: as namely, in denying Faith to be the *Instrumental Cause* of Justification, &c. but I take no pleasure in making the very worst of what can be made of his expressions, and shall therefore say no more of that.

CXCIII.

Me-thinks it should put Mr. *Sb.* to the blush, and make him smite upon his Breast, if after all that hath been said, I should prove that the great Rabbies of the Popish Church, have now,
and

and then written much more Orthodoxly, and Protestant-like, touching Justification than he himself hath done. *Bellarmin, De Justif. l. 1. Cap. 2.* saith thus. *This is briefly to be here observed, that Christ is not the meritorious cause of Justification, as if the Father in favour to his son did forgive us our sins; as Kings assoil guilty Persons out of favour to, and at the suit of Friends, but because he hath pay'd an exact price of ransom, and thereby in rigour of justice made satisfaction for the wickedness of us all. What could any Protestant writer say in this point more? saith Mr. Gattaker, p. 15.*

Hear *Bellarmin* again, *Lib. 2. De Justif. cap. 10.* *Dicitur inquit Christus Justitia nostra quoniam satisfecit Patri pro nobis, & eam satisfactionem ita nobis donat, & communicat, quum nos iustificat, ut nostra satisfactio, & justitia dici possit. Nam etsi per justitiam nobis inherentem vere iusti nominemur, & simus, tamen non per eam satisfacimus Deo pro culpis nostris, & pena aeterna, &c. Non esset absurdum si quis diceret nobis imputari Christi Justitiam & merita, cum nobis donentur & applicentur ac si nos ipsi Deo satisfecissemus, &c.*

Gabriel Vasquez, Tom. 2. in 1.2. Disput. 222. cap. 1. saith thus. *Verba ista Concilii Tridentini Quamquam nemo possit esse iustus, nisi cui merita Passionis Domini nostri Iesu Christi communicantur, dicit idem significare ac si diceret nisi cui merita passionis Domini nostri Iesu Christi imputantur. Disput. vero 203. affirmat recte dici posse merita Christi nobis imputari quum agitur de causa meritoria justificationis, quoniam imputari nobis Christi merita*

merita idem est, quod merita illa nobis applicari, & communicari. Upon which Expressions put together, *Le Blanc* doth thus animadvert in his Discourse, *De justitia Christi fidelibus imputata.* Unde patet Scholæ Romanæ Theologos immerito carpere nostram de Imputatione justitiæ Christi Doctrinam quandoquidem nihil hac in parte re vera sentimus quod vis veritatis ipsos non cogat agnoscere. Thef. 36. That is, *The Romish Divines do unjustly carp at our Doctrine concerning the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness, sith there is nothing that we think in this matter, which the force of Truth doth not compel them to acknowledge.*

CXCIV.

Not to give Mr. Sh. the odium of quoting all, or the greatest part, of those passages which do occur in Popish Writers, concerning the *Imputation of Christ's Righteousness*, and other matters relating to Justification, in which divers of them have been more Orthodox than himself; I do in the next place aver, that the *Homilies* of the Church of *England* are as plain and positive for our Justification by the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness, as Mr. *Sherlock* is, or can be against it, and do in some other matters referring to Justification, manifestly contradict him, or he them.

CXC V.

In the Homilie, or Sermon of *Salvation*, we find such passages as follow. *Because all men be sinners, and Offenders against God, therefore can*

no man by his own Acts Works, and Deeds (seem they never so good) be justified, and made righteous before God: but every man of necessity is constrained to seek for another righteousness, or justification to be received at God's own hands, &c. Again, God sent his only son into the World to fulfill the Law for us, and by shedding his most precious Blood to make a sacrifice and satisfaction, or (as it may be called) amends to his Father for our sins, &c. Again, The Grace of God doth not shut out the justice of God in our justification, but only shutteth out the justice of man, that is, the justice of our Works, &c. Again, Faith doth not shut out Repentance, Hope, Love, and the fear of God to be joyned with Faith in every man that is justified, but it shutteth them out from the effect of justifying. Yet more plainly in the same Homily. So that Christ is now the righteousness of them that do truly believe in him. He for them paid the ransom by his death. He for them fulfilled the Law in his Life. So that now in him, and by him every true Christian may be called a fulfiller of the Law: forasmuch as that which their infirmity lacketh, Christ's justice hath supplied. Again, in the second Homily of Salvation, we meet with such passages as follow. Consider diligently these words without works, by Faith only, freely we receive remission of our sins; what can be spoken more plainly, than to say, That freely, without works, by Faith only, we obtain remission of our sins? This Doctrine (viz. That Faith only justifieth, as the margent sheweth) advanceth the true Glory of Christ, and beatech down the vain glory of man: This whosoever deni-

denieth is not to be accounted for a Christian man; nor for a setter forth of Christ's Glory, but for an Adversary to Christ, and his Gospel, and for a setter forth of mans vain-glory. Let Mr. Sherlock weigh those words well. Again, Man cannot make himself righteous by his own works, neither in part, nor in the whole, for that were the greatest arrogancy, and presumption of man, that Anti-Christ could set up against God, to affirm that a man might by his own works take away and purge his own sins, and so justifie himself. Again, The true understanding of this Doctrine; we be justified freely by Faith without works, or that we be justified by Faith in Christ only, is not that this our own act to believe in Christ doth justifie us, for that were to count our selves to be justified by some act, or virtue that is in our selves, &c. Towards the end of that Homily are these words, So that our Faith in Christ (as it were) saith unto us thus; It is not I that take away your sins, but it is Christ only I send you to for that purpose, forsaking therein all your good virtues, words, thoughts, and works, and only putting your trust in Christ.

Again, in the third Homily of Salvation, are these expressions. Nevertheless because Faith doth directly send us to Christ, for remission of our sins, and that by Faith given us of God we embrace the promise of God's Mercy, and of the remission of our sins (which thing none other of our virtues, or works properly doth) therefore Scripture useth to say, that Faith without works doth justifie.

CXCVI.

He that runs may read the fore said passages quoted out of the three Homilies of *Salvation* to be directly opposite to several notions delivered by Mr. *Sh.* in his Book, in reference to the Doctrine of Justification. For 1. Whereas Mr. *Sh.* confoundeth justifying *Faith* and all other Graces, *Faith* and Gospel-Obedience, *Faith* and sincere good works, and maketh as if they were one, and the same thing (witness what he saith in p. 273. of his Book) the Homilies fore-quoted do manifestly distinguish betwixt *Faith* and other Graces, but more plainly betwixt *Faith* and good works. Witness that passage, *Faith* doth not shut out Hope, Love, Repentance, and the fear of God to be joyned with *Faith* in every man that is justified, but it shuts them out from the Office of justifying. Now, if *Faith*, and all these Graces were one, and the same *Faith* should shut out it self from the Office of justifying, according to them. Divers passages fore-quoted do shew that the Homilies do frequently oppose *Faith* and works, *Ex. gr.* this for one. Consider diligently these words without works by *Faith* only freely we receive remission of our sins: what can be spoken more plainly, than to say, that freely, without works, by *Faith* only we obtain remission of our sins? 2. Whereas Mr. *Sh.* interesteth all Evangelick Obedience, internal Holiness, and sincere good works, in justification, as truly, and as much, as *Faith* it self (as he must needs do who makes them the same with *Faith*,

Faith, or to be Faith it self) divers passages alledged out of the Homilies in the fore-going Thesis do expressly deny and contradict that assertion of his; witness that terrible passage which I would wish Mr. Sh. to think of, namely, That *Faith only* (that is, without works concurring as to that, for that the Margent sheweth to be the thing treated of) *justifieth* *advanceth* the true glory of Christ, and *beareth down* the vain-glory of man: This whosoever denieth is not to be accounted for a Christian man, nor for a setter forth of Christ's glory; but for an adversary to Christ and his Gospel, and for a setter forth of man's vain-glory. 3. Whereas Mr. Sh. makes as if Faith it self, the very *credere*, the habit, or act of believing (whatsoever he understands thereby) were the matter of our Righteousness, or our very Evangelical Righteousness before God, the Homily is plain against him in these words. *The true understanding of this Doctrine we be justified freely by Faith without Works, is not that this our act to believe in Christ doth justify us, for that were to count our selves to be justified by some act, or virtue in our selves.* 4. Whereas Mr. Sh. utterly denyeth, and derideth *Imputed Righteousness*, witness the passages which I have quoted out of his Book in Thesis 179. to which I shall add one or two more, *viz.* that in p. 276. of Mr. Sh's. book, where he concludes thus. *Thus you see that there is no foundation in Scripture for all this talk of personal Righteousness of Christ inherent in him, and imputed to us* Allo, Sh. p. 273. *Thus you see how the Apostle opposeth the Righteousness*

ousness of the Law to the Righteousness of Faith, not as an inherent, and personal to an Imputed Righteousness; but as an external, and Ritual, to an inherent, real, and substantial Righteousness. This is (saith Mr. Sh.) the reason of the Foundation of all other mistakes in this matter, that by the righteousness of the Law, and the righteousness of Works, most men understand an inherent holiness, the conformity of our hearts, and lives to all moral Precepts, and Rules of good life; and then conclude that if this righteousness will not please God, nothing but an imputed righteousness can, though I should have rather concluded that nothing can: but the truth is, the righteousness of the Law, and of Works in the New Testament signifies only an external righteousness, which cannot please God; and that internal holiness which they call the righteousness of the Law, is that very righteousness of Faith which the Gospel commands, and which God approves, and rewards, and this imputed righteousness is no where to be found, that I know of, but in their own fancies. If this long Paragraph be not quite contrary to what the Homily declareth, I am much deceived. The words of the Homily are these. *Man cannot make himself righteous by his own works, neither in part, nor in the whole; for that were the greatest Arrogancy, and Presumption of man, that Antichrist could set up against God, to affirm that a man might by his own works take away his own sins, and so justify himself.* But saith Mr. Sh. *If internal holiness will not please God (that is, be accepted by him as that righteousness whereby a sinner is justified in his sight, for of that he was speaking)*

I should have concluded that nothing can. Who can reconcile that passage of his to this in the Homily, which followeth. Because all men be sinners, and offenders against God, therefore can no man by his own acts, words, and deeds, be justified, and made righteous before God; but every man is constrained to seek for another righteousness or justification to be received at God's own hand, &c. And again, God sent his only Son into the world to fulfil the Law for us, and by shedding his most precious blood to make a sacrifice and satisfaction, and (as it may be called) amends to his Father for our sins, &c. Which passage in the Homily plainly tells us another way how God comes to be pleased with sinners, so far forth as to justify them: then upon their inherent righteousness, or internal holiness (which yet is very necessary for other purposes) viz. upon the account of Christ his atonement, and satisfaction, which being not theirs subjectively, and inherently if it be not imputed to them, they can have no benefit by it. The Homily saith expressly, that every man is constrained to seek another righteousness (viz. than that of his own works and deeds) to be received at God's own hand. The Homily tells you that our very Faith, or believing is far from justifying us, or being the matter of our righteousness before God, witness these words. So that our Faith in Christ (as it were) saith to us thus. It is not I that can take away your sins, but it is Christ only; I send you to him for that purpose, forsaking therein all your good virtue, thoughts, words, and works, and only putting your trust in Christ, &c. Again, The
 third

third *Homily of Salvation* saith, *Faith doth directly send us to Christ for remission of sins, and that by Faith we imbrace the promise of God's mercy (which thing no other of our virtues, or works properly doth) therefore scripture useth to say, that Faith without works doth justifie.* which passage, forasmuch as it excludeth other graces, and works, besides *Faith*, from the justifying of a sinner upon this account; that they do not, like *Faith*, properly imbrace the promise of God's mercy, and remission of sin, plainly implieth, and intimateth, that *Faith* doth justifie only *correlatively* to its object *Christ*, and his righteousness, which can be made ours no otherwise than by *imputation*, or gracious accepting of us as if we were perfectly righteous with an inherent formal righteousness of our own, sith it is not ours internally. Therefore there is such a thing as *imputed righteousness*, and that *Faith* that lays hold upon it is a grace by it self, distinct from other graces, and other good works, and is the only instrument on mans part, whereby he is justified. All this I say is true if the *Homilies* of the *Church of England* may be credited. And now methinks I hear those men who find the *Articles*, and the *Homilies* of the *Church of England* to stand so much in their light, crying out concerning those that pen'd them, *Utinam nescissent literas* (as one concerning himself) would to God they had been illiterate men, that had never learn'd to write: and (pretending that the Doctrine of *imputed righteousness*, will destroy all good *Ethicks*) making bold to abuse the *Homilies*, and that text toge-

CXCVII.

The *Church of England* is not singular in the Doctrine declared in their *Homilies* (the Comment of their Articles) viz. that we are justified by the *Imputation of the righteousness of Christ apprehended by Faith*: for it were easie to produce a cloud of Witnesses consenting with them in this matter, and plainly affirming the same thing in their Writings, viz. *Luther, Melancthon, Bucer, Brentius, Chytraeus, Hemingius, Zuinglius, Oecolampadius, Grynaeus, Bullinger, Calvin, Gualter, Danaus, Zanchy, Beza, Peter Martyr, Musculus, Pareus, Ursinus, Marlorat, Junius, Tossanus, Sybrandus, Bucanus, Pezelius, Aretius, Chamier*, to omit the eminent Divines of our own Nation, such as *Whittaker, Perkins, Pemble, &c.* who have written to the like purpose. But oh how vastly doth one Mr. *Sh.* outweigh all these?
 &c.

CXCVIII.

Whereas in my *Prodromus* I undertook to produce nine eminent Bishops, (eight of them of the *Church of England*) all setting their faces against that notion of Justification which Mr. *Sherlock* hath delivered to us, viz. that we are not justified by the righteousness of Christ imputed to us, but by our own sincere obedience to the Gospel (which, saith he, is called the righteousness of Faith) having already produced two of the nine, viz. Bp. *Davenant*, and Bp. *Downam*

Dounam, in variety of instances; there remains but seven, the first whereof I shall now instance in is *Bp. Hall*, whom I find as opposite to *Mr. Sherlock* in this matter, as a man can be. His words are as follow. *The Evangelical Justice* (saith *Bp. Hall*) *is not without the intervention of a Saviour*; to which claim is laid in two kinds: either as imputative, or as inherent. The inherent wrought in us, the imputed wrought for us. It is the main care of our lives, and deaths, what shall give us peace, and acceptation before the dreadful Tribunal of God: What but righteousness? What righteousness, or whose? Ours, or Christ's? Ours in the inherent graces wrought in us, in the holy works wrought by us; or Christ's in his most perfect obedience, and meritorious satisfaction wrought for us, and applyed to us? The Tridentine saith is for the former (and so we may say is *Mr. Sh.*) we for the latter. God is as direct on our side as his word can make him; every where blazoning the defects of our our own righteousness, the imperfections of our best graces, the deadly nature of our least sins, the radical sinfulness of our habitual concupiscence, the pollution of our best works: every where extolling the perfect obedience of our Redeemer, the gracious application of that obedience, the sweet comfort of that application, the assurance and unfailableness of that comfort; and lastly, our happy rest in that assurance. Wo were to us if we were not more just in that, than sanctified in our selves. We are sanctified in part, according to the weakness of our receipt, we are justified thoroughly according to the perfectness of thy acceptation. Were we thoroughly sanctified here, we

Should be more than men, were we not thoroughly justified we should be no more than sinners before thee, while we stand before thee as sinners we can have no peace. Let others trust in the Chariots and Horses of their own strength, we will remember the Lord our God. The work of thy Justice (or righteousness) shall be our Peace. Thus far that Excellent and acute Bishop.

CXCIX.

The Learned Bishop *Prideaux*, sometimes professor of Divinity at Oxford, in his Book called *Fasciculus Controversiarum* (over and above what may be met with in his other works) giveth ample testimony to the Doctrine of Believers their being justified by the Righteousness of Christ imputed to them, and received by Faith alone. That only Faith on man's part doth justify, he proves by this Argument, for one, p. 266. *Per quod solummodo imputatur nobis Christi Justitia*, &c. That by which alone, or by which only, the Righteousness of Christ is imputed to us which satisfieth God's Law, and for man's lapse, by that only on our part we are justified. But we are justified only by his grace through the redemption which is Christ Jesus, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through Faith in his Blood to declare his Righteousness, Rom. 3. 24. Whence Christ is made to us Wisdom, Righteousness, and Redemption, 1 Cor. 1. 30. In that Argument he plainly declares his Judgment for our being justified by the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness, for by that

that he proves we are justified by *Faith* alone on our part, for that alone receiveth, or layeth hold on that Righteousness whereby God justifieth a Sinner, or whereby, *ex parte Dei*, or with respect unto God, a Sinner is justified. Yea, one of his Arguments to prove that we are justified by Faith alone, is this, *viz. That Doctrine* (saith he) *which distinguisheth saving Christianity from Judaism, Turcism, and Heathenism* is to be received by all Christians: But such is this *Doctrine* (saith he) of Justification by Faith alone, because Christ is the end of the Law for Righteousness to every one that believeth, Rom. 10. 4. But if the Doctrine of Imputed Righteousness be over-thrown, the Doctrine of Justification by Faith alone, (as on Man's part) falls to the ground, as Bp. Prideaux intimates, for he builds this upon that, and consequently according to that Learned Prelate, the great thing which should distinguish us from *Jews, Turks, and Heathens*, is taken away; which assertion of his is a kind of calling them (by craft, as they say) either *Jews, Turks, or Heathens*, who deny the Doctrine of Christ's Imputed Righteousness, for in so doing they must needs deny the Doctrine of Justification by Faith alone, (*ex parte hominis*) for it is the Righteousness of Christ which Faith layeth hold upon, &c. Also in p. 298. having started this Objection. If the Imputed Righteousness of Christ apprehended by Faith be that which alone doth justify us, then should we be as Righteous as Christ himself; his Answer to it is this, *juxta verita-*

rem rei æque sumus justis sed non æqualiter, nec eodem modo, cum ille justus sic subjective, nos imputative, ille de proprio nos illius largitate. It follows not (saith he) that we are Righteous equally with Christ himself, because he is righteous *subjectively* (or in himself) we but *Imputatively* (or by the accounting of his righteousness to us) and accepting his Righteousness for us, and on our behalf.) No more need to be said to prove that that Learned Bishop (whose Authority certainly may go as far as Mr. *Sherlock's*) was a hearty assertor of the now despised Doctrine of *Imputed Righteousness*.

C C.

Edwinus London (as he writes himself) that is *Edwin Sands*, then Bishop of London, in an Epistle of his before *Luther's Commentary on the Galatians* (which I know not whether I should not call his solemn License for that Book) writes thus.

This Book being brought to me to peruse, and to consider of, I thought it my part not only to allow of it to the Print, but also to commend it to the Reader, as a Treatise most comfortable to all afflicted Consciences exercised in the School of Christ. This Author felt what he spake, and had experience of what he wrought, &c. Satan is the Enemy; The Victory is only by Faith in Christ. This most necessary Doctrine the Author hath most substantially cleared in this his Commentary. Which being written in Latine certain godly learned men have translated

lated into our Language to the great benefit of all such, as with humbled hearts will read the same.

If this most Reverend Bishop had not been a hearty Friend to the Doctrine of *Imputed Righteousness*, he would never have given so high a Commendation of *Luther's* work upon the Epistle to the *Galatians*, which doubtless is full of that kind of Doctrine; yea, surely, had he been of *Mr. Sherlock's* mind, he would have been so far from Licencing that Book himself, with respect, and Honour, that by his good will, no body else should have Licenced it, but rather have told the World that it was idle talk, and meer tittle tattle.

CCI.

The Excellent Bishop of *Norwich*, that now is, in his Explication of the 110th. Psalm, p. 440. having in the fore going page spoken of Christ his suffering for us, as our Head, and Surety (for so he speaks) saith, *The fruit which redounds to us hereby is the Expiation of our sins, by the imputing of his Righteousness unto us. This is my Blood of the New Testament, which was shed for many for the remission of sin, Mat. 26. 28. And in whom we have redemption through his Blood, the forgiveness of sins, Eph. 1. 7. The manner whereby the satisfaction of Christ becomes profitable to us unto the remission of sin, and Righteousness is by Imputation, Rom. 4. 3. 5. 8. 5. 19. Now, all the World is guilty before God, in unbelief, it lyeth in mischief, and therefore must be justified by a foreign Righteousness, and that equal*

to the Justice offended, which is the Righteousness of God unto us graciously imputed. As there is a Personal and individual unity whereby a man is one; in, and by himself: So there is a common unity whereby a man is one with another. And this is the ground of righteousness imputed. *Unitas enim præstantis est fundamentum proprietatis ad officium præstitum*, i. e. Oneness with the performer is the foundation of our propriety to the good Office performed. So then betwixt Christ and us there must be an Unity, or else there can be no Imputation. It is said, that Faith is Imputed for righteousness, Rom. 4. 5. not the *credere*, or the Act of Believing as it is a work proceeding from us by grace, but because it is the bond of Union betwixt us, and Christ, and by that means makes way to the Imputation of Christs righteousness to us. 'Tis generally consented to by them that have read his Works that Dr. Reynolds, now Bishop of Norwich, useth to write *sense*, and nothing but what is good *sense*, and yet I find all the passages fore-mentioned in that book of his, which I mentioned before, nor do I know how much time it would take up to transcribe all that that Excellent Person has said concerning Imputed righteousness, in his several most worthy Writings. These that I have quoted are enough to shew that he, and Mr. Sh. are not of a judgment about that grand affair.

CCII.

Bishop Andrews, who is universally owned to have been an excellent Scholar, and an able Divine, in his Sermon of *Justification* (towards the

the end of his Book of Sermons) writes thus. In the Scripture (saith he) there is a double righteousness set down both in the Old, and in the New Testament. in the Old Testament, and in the very first place that righteousness is mentioned in the Bible, Gen. 18. 10. Abraham believed, and it was counted to him for righteousness. And again in the very next line it is mentioned, Abraham will teach his house to do righteousness. A righteousness done. In the New likewise, the former, in one chapter (even the fourth to the Romans) no fewer than eleven times Reputatum est illi ad Justitiam. A reputed righteousness. The latter in St. John 1. 3, 7. He that doth righteousness is righteous. A righteousness done. The one is a quality of the party, the other an act of the Judge declaring, or pronouncing righteous. The one ours by influence, or infusion, the other by account, or imputation: when Christ is called Jehovah, our righteousness, that great Bishop expoundeth it of righteousness imputed: For (saith he p. 76.) The tenour of the Scripture touching our justification all along runs in judicial terms. When we shall once be brought and arraigned before the righteous judge sitting upon the throne (which he speaks alluding to Prov. 20. 8.) we shall there see that righteousness in that sense (whereby he meaneth inherent righteousness) will not abide the trial. Bring them hither then (meaning to God's Tribunal) and ask them here of this name, and never a Saint, nor Father, no not the Schoolmen themselves, but will shew how to understand it aright. In their Commentaries it may be in their Questions, and Debates they will hold hard
for

the other : but remove them hither, they forsake it presently, and take the name in the right sense. Just and perfect Job standing here. Though I be just (saith he) I will not hold up my head (i. e.) will never plead it, or stand upon, but put up a supplication to be relieved by Jehovah, *Iustitia nostra*. David dareth not stand here, but desireth God not to enter into judgment with him, &c. But if we must come (viz. to the judgment of God, as thither we must come all) then he will never account his own righteousness, but make mention of this name, Jehovah *iustitia nostra*. Daniel, that man so greatly beloved, after he saw the Antient of days set down on his Throne, and the book open before him there : Not in our righteousness, Dan. 9. 18. Yet was that righteousness a Jehovah, (from the Lord) but here it would not serve, he must wait for the Messiah, and the everlasting righteousness which he bringeth with him. Esay, at the Vision of God sitting upon his Throne, crieth out, Woe is me, I am a man of polluted lips : Woe is me, for I have held my peace. There he seeth that the very sins of omission, and the very sins of his lips would be enough to condemn him, though he had never in act committed any. St. Paul saith, Though I know nothing by my self, and so had justification a Domino, I am not therefore justified : It is another righteousness, and not that, must acquit him. Yea, the very Schoolmen themselves (saith he) take them from their Questions, *Quodlibets*, &c. let them be in the Soliloquies, Meditations, or Devotions, and specially in directing how to deal with men in their last agony, when the Judge stands before the door, then take Anselm, take Bonaven-

neventure, take Gerson, you would not wish to find Jehovah our Righteousness better, or more pregnantly acknowledged, than in them you shall find it. And indeed, saith he, so far as concerneth satisfaction for sin, and our escaping from eternal death, the Church of Rome taketh this name aright, and now they find no such absurdity in it, that Christ his righteousness, and merit, are imputed to us: but in the positive Justice, or that part thereof which is meritorious for reward, there fall they into a phansie that a righteousness inherent in themselves, without the righteousness that is in Christ, will serve them. The reason, saith Bellarmin, why in satisfaction for sin we need Christ's righteousness to be accounted ours is because the offence is infinite. We reason a pari. There must also be an infinite merit, because the reward is no less infinite. Is there not as much required to purchase for us the Crown of Glory, as to redeem us from the torments of Hell? Bellarmin, after his long Disputation, taking upon him to answer a case of Conscience, whether a man might repose any trust in that which he had so long argued for, saith at last, that Propter incertitudinem propriæ Justitiæ, & periculum inanis gloriæ, tutissimum est fiduciam totam in sola Dei misericordia reponere. That is, Considering the uncertainty of man's righteousness, and the dangerousness of vain-glory, it is most safe to repose all our confidence in the mercy of God alone. Thus far Bp. Andrews, besides several other passages which might be gathered out of his Sermon of Justification, on Jer. 23. 6. which he translates thus; *This is the name whereby they shall call him, The Lord our Righteousness.* Plainly declaring

declaring his stedfast Judgment to have been for the Doctrine of *Imputed Righteousness*, and for the insufficiency of any *Righteousness Inherent*, as for the purpose of *Justification*. How much were it to be wished that Mr. *Sh.* were but as Orthodox in that point, and that he had taken in his first seasoning from such sound Authors as was that renowned *Bishop*, rather than from *Socinus*, or any of his Complices.

CCIII.

The late Reverend Bishop of Gloucester in his *Exposition of the Catechism of the Church of England*, p. 71. hath these words. *But yet full satisfaction he may plead* (speaking of a Believer) *The Obedience of the Son of God both Active and Passive; Active, in keeping and fulfilling every title of the Law; and Passive, in suffering the wrath of God due for the breach of the Law: Out of which Obedience ariseth that actual justice in Christ, that being imputed to us, in respect of that Relation in which we stand unto Christ (he and all his Elect being taken for one Body) God doth release, acquit, and discharge the guilty sinner. And p. 73. God imputing to all penitent, and believing sinners the Obedience of his own Son, and his righteousness accounts them just in his sight.* No man that reads those passages can doubt that Learned Prelate (for so his works speak him) to have been positive and peremptory for the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness to Believers, and their Justification thereby, which he lays down as a Catechistical, Fundamental Truth, for
writing

writing an Exposition upon the Church Catechism, his whole business lyes with such Truths as those; Therefore in his Epistle Dedicatory to the present Arch-Bishop of Canterbury, he hath these words. *I thought it my Duty to invoke your Lordships Patronage, and that you would be my Backler, as you haven been hitherto, against any that would dare to oppose these solid, and fundamental Truths, which none will be so impudent to contradict, but branded Hereticks, and hot-brain'd Phanaticks* I suppose Mr. Sh. do's not take himself to be either of those two; but you see what that Learned Prelate saith of all them who contradict the Truths asserted in his Exposition of the Catechism, which he calls *fundamental*, (and I am sure Justification is one of the greatest points that can be handled in any Catechism; therefore the Truths that concern that must be great *Fundamentals*) I say, you see what he saith of such Persons, in *Thesi* and it is no hard thing to reduce it *ad Hypothesin*.

CCIV.

Bishop Abbot, in his Defence of Mr. Perkins his book, called *The Reformed Catholick*, against Dr. Bishop, doth highly assert and vindicate the Doctrine of Justification by Christ's Righteousness *Imputed*, witness the following passages. 1. In p. 381. *That our Justification and Righteousness before God standeth not in any inward virtues, or graces poured into our Souls, but in the Imputation of Christ's Obedience, and Righteousness made ours by Faith shall be proved unto him,*
God

God willing, by better Arguments than he shall be able to disprove. 2. In p. 382. he saith,

It is truly said by Mr. Perkins, that the Church of Rome in teaching justification by Works doth raze the very Foundation of Christian Faith, and maketh Christ but a counterfeit and false Christ; because, as saith the Apostle, If Righteousness be by the Law, then Christ dyed in vain, Gal. 2. 21. Therefore peremptorily he denounceth, Ye are abolished from Christ, ye are fallen from Grace whosoever are justified by the Law, Gal. 5. 4. 3. In p. 384. In whom (speaking of Christ) and not in our selves, we are made the Righteousness of God; that is, just in the sight of God, in that his Obedience, and Righteousness performed and wrought in our Name, and for our behoof, is imputed unto us, by Faith in his Blood. 4. In p. 388. Bp. Abbot vindicates Mr. Perkins his first reason for imputed Righteousness, viz. That which must be our Righteousness before God must satisfie the Justice of the Law, which saith, Do these things and thou shalt live. But there is nothing that can satisfie that justice of the Law but the Righteousness, and Obedience of Christ. Ergo. 5. In p. 400. he vindicates Mr. Perkins his second reason for imputed Righteousness, viz. That, As Christ was made sin for us, so we are made the Righteousness of God in him, 2 Cor. 5. 21. But Christ was made sin by the Imputation of our sins, he being most Holy: Therefore a sinner is made Righteous in that Christ's Righteousness is Imputed to him. 6. In p. 404. the excellent Bp. afore-said vindicates Mr. Perkins his third Reason

Reason for imputed Righteousness, viz. from *Rom. 5. As by one mans disobedience, &c.* whence he argues thus. *As by the disobedience of Adam men were made sinners, so by the Obedience of Christ they are made righteous: But men are made Sinners by Imputation of Adam's sin unto them, Ergo. By Imputation of Christ's Justice we are made righteous.* 7. In p. 413. he vindicateth Mr. Perkins his fourth and last Reason for imputed Righteousness, taken from the consent of the Ancient Church, &c. 8. In p. 422. Bp. Abbot takes upon him to defend the Answers which Mr. Perkins gave to all and every the Objections which the Papists bring against *Imputed* righteousness, and the Arguments for Justification by a Righteousness *Inherent*. Thus you see that Mr. Perkins himself was not a greater assertor of the imputation of Christ's Righteousness to believers, and their Justification thereby, than was the Learned and Excellent Bishop Abbot, whose Judgment, and Authority will weigh in the balance, against twenty such young Gentlemen, with their shels upon their heads, as he that hath taken upon him to oppose and deride it.

CCV.

Bp. Morton, in his book called, *The Protestants Appeal*, p. 69. plainly declareth himself for *Imputed righteousness*, by his quoting for the confirmation of it the following passage out of venerable Bede. *Nothing can be more for our Justification by the imputed merits of our head Christ*
N them

than that his Heavenly axiome, saying, the condemnation of Christ is our justification. Nothing more opposite unto the Romish justifying by Inherent perfection than (speaking of the regenerate) to say, no man shall be saved by the righteousness of Works, but by the only righteousness of Faith. Now, that by Faith there he would have us to understand the Object of Faith, viz. the righteousness of Christ which Faith takes hold of, and relatively to which Faith is said to justify, may be gathered from a similitude which he useth, in p. 630. Yet understand, good Reader (saith he) that of as a ring of Gold wherein there is inclosed a precious Stone of some singular virtue to cure thy Disease, thou ushest to say that the ring doth cure thy grief, yet not of it's own virtue, although it be of Gold, but by the power of the precious Stone, which it contains; so say we; that Faith justifieth, but not by any merit, or worthiness in it self, although it be the gift of God, and a virtue Theological, but by the power and virtue of Christ his precious merit of redemption, the object which it claspeth, and apprehendeth.

CCVI.

The incomparable Primate of Armagh, Bp. Usher, in his *Body of Divinity*, p. 193. and in several other parts thereof, declareth himself abundantly for the Doctrine of Justification by Christ's Righteousness Imputed.

Justification, saith he, is the Sentence of God, whereby he of his Grace for the righteousness of his Son, by him imputed to us, and through Faith apprehended by us, doth free us from sin and Death,
and

and account us righteous unto Life. For hereby we both have a deliverance from the Guilt, and punishment of all our sins, and being accounted righteous in the sight of God by the righteousness of our Saviour Christ imputed to us, are restored to a better Righteousness than ever we had in Adam. p. 194. Thus God imputing the righteousness of Christ to a sinner doth not account his sins to him, but interests him in a state of as full, and perfect freedom, and acceptance, as if he had never sinned, or had himself fully satisfied. The matter of Justification, or that righteousness whereby a sinner stands justified in God's sight, is not any righteousness inherent in his own Person, and performed by him, but a perfect righteousness inherent in Christ, and performed for him. The Form, or being Cause of our justification, and that which makes the Righteousness of Christ so really ours that it doth justify us is the gracious Imputation of God the Father accounting his Son's righteousness unto the sinner, and by that allowing, making it his to all effects, as if he himself had performed it. Thus far Bp. Usher. Then he puts the Question. But how can Christ's righteousness be accounted ours? Is it not as absurd to say that we are justified by Christ's righteousness, as that a man should be wise with the wisdom of another? &c. Answereth it thus; no doubtless, because this righteousness is in Christ, not as in a person severed from us, but as in the Head of the Church, the second Adam, from whom therefore it is communicated to all, who being united as Members to him do lay claim thereunto, and apply it unto themselves, Rom. 5. 19. Rom. 10. 4. For if

the sin of Adam were of force to condemn us all, because we were in his Loins, he being the head of our common Nature; why then should it seem strange that the Righteousness of our Saviour Christ, both God, and Man, should be available to justify those that are interested in him especially considering we have a more strict conjunction in the Spirit with him, than ever we had in Nature with Adam? And though it be not fit to measure Heavenly things by the Yard of reason, yet it is not unreasonable that a man owing a thousand pounds, and not being able to pay it, his Creditor may be satisfied by one of his Friends. In p. 196. that Excellent Prelate hath this passage. So that Faith justifieth only relatively, in respect of the Object which it justifieth on; to wit, the righteousness of Christ, by which we are justified: Faith being only the Instrument to convey so great a benefit unto the Soul, as the hand of the Beggar receives the Almes.

CCVII.

The opposers of Christ's *Imputed righteousness*, and of Justification by Faith alone, on Man's part, are found Fighters not only against the Writings of the Generality of the most eminent Divines of the Reformed Churches (as I have instanced in above thirty) but also against many Renowned Bishops of the Church of *England*, whose Names and sayings have been mentioned; and not against them only, but also against the *Homilies*, as hath been made appear by several passages alledged from thence, which are point-blank against them; yea, over
and

and above all that, they will appear to fight against the *eleventh Article of the Church of England*, tiled; *Of the justification of man*. For that *Article* runs thus; *We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by Faith, and not for our own Works, or deservings. Wherefore that we are justified by Faith only is most wholsom Doctrine, and full of comfort*. Those are the very words of the *Article*. By the *merits* of Christ doubtless are meant his Active, and Passive Obedience, or what he did and suffered for Believers, in order to meriting and purchasing Eternal Life for them, which Obedience of our Saviour we call his *righteousness*. Now, saith the *Article*, we are accounted Righteous before God (that is, we are justified *only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ*. But, saith Mr. Sh. (and as many as are of his mind) we are accounted Righteous before God for our sincere Obedience to the Gospel, or for our internal Holiness. For, saith he, p. 273. having spoken just before of *Internal Holiness, and the conformity of our hearts and Lives to all moral Precepts*. *If this righteousness will not please God, I should have concluded that nothing can*. He goes on, and saith, *That Internal Holiness, which they call the righteousness of the Law, is that very righteousness of Faith which the Gospel commands, and which God approves and rewards; and this Imputed righteousness is nowhere to be found but in their own fancies*. From those words of his I Argue thus against him. A man is counted Righteous

before God (or justified, which is the same thing) for that which is his Righteousness, especially his only Righteousness in the sight of God. But according to Mr. Sh. our only Evangelical Righteousness in the sight of God is our internal Holiness, and conformity of our hearts and lives to all moral Principles, and Rules of a good life. *Ergo.* By our internal Holiness we are counted righteous (savingly) or justified in the sight of God. Imputed Righteousness being no where to be found that Mr. Sh. knows of, but in mens own fancies, men must necessarily be justified by inherent Righteousness, according to Mr. Sh. or without any righteousness at all. The latter cannot be, that a man should be righteous without any righteousness; therefore he is so in the sight of God, and to salvation (for that we are speaking of) by, and for his inherent holiness, or Gospel obedience. And if so, Then Believers are not accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of Jesus Christ (as the Article saith) yea so far from that, that they are not counted righteous before God, so much as partly, or in part, for the merit of Christ; because their only righteousness (according to Mr. Sh.) is their internal holiness, and conformity to moral Precepts. Again, If we are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of Jesus Christ, as the Article saith, then we are so accounted by, and for, an *imputed righteousness*; yea by, and for an *imputed righteousness* only. For there are but two ways whereby any righteousness can be

ours;

ours: viz. either by *Inherency*, or by *Imputation*. But the merits of Jesus Christ are not *inherent* in us; therefore if they be our righteousness in the sight of God, they must be *imputed* to us. Nothing can be more plain than that, if we are justified by the righteousness of another, viz. of Christ, we are justified by a righteousness *imputed*, and not *inherent*; and consequently that there is such a thing as *imputed righteousness*, elsewhere than in the fancies of men. Sure I am, The merits of Christ can avail us nothing, unless they be imputed, or reckoned to us; or unless God, upon the account thereof (and not of our own internal holiness) do deal with us, as if we in, and of our selves had been worthy of eternal life, Christ's meriting had signified nothing to us, unless he had merited for us, or with an intention that his merits should be put to our account; as Christ's giving up himself to death, had been of no use to us, unless he had loved us, and given himself for us. If Christ's merit be not imputed to us, for the accepting of us righteous before God, we have no advantage by it any more than a man can have had by a plaister that was never applied. Now they that say we are justified only for the merit of Christ (or for the righteousness of Christ imputed, which hath been prov'd to come all to one,) as saith the *Article* of our Church, do vastly differ from Mr. Sh. that saith we are not justified, no not partly, by *Imputed Righteousness*; yea indeed, that there is no such thing. If his evasion should be that Christ hath merited that our sincere obe-

dience, and God's acceptance thereof, instead of that which is compleat and perfect, should be the *matter*, and *form* of our justification, or righteousness before God (which is like the Papists notion, *viz.* that works dyed in the blood of Christ do justifie) I say, such a notion as that is very unsound and unsafe. For that were to make as if Christ did give away the glory of Justification, and Salvation to another, *viz.* to our *Gospel obedience*; and died not to save us himself, but make us Saviours to our selves: or had said to *Faith*, and *Good Works*, as *Joab* did to *David*, 2 Sam. 12. 27. *I have fought against Rab-bab, and have taken the City of Waters. Now therefore encamp thou against the City and take it, lest I take the City, and it be called after my name.* i. e. he had as good as done the work, but he would have *David* have the honor of it. To say that Christ merited that we might merit; (or be counted worthy of eternal life upon account of our own inherent righteousness, which is all one) is to say that Christ who merited that we should be saved by his *Grace*, merited that we should be saved by our own works, which is a contradiction to reason, and a turning the Covenant of Grace into a Covenant of Works. To say that Christ hath merited that our sincere, though imperfect obedience to the Gospel should be the righteousness whereby we are counted savingly righteous before God; is, 1. To attribute the Pardon of our sins to our own good works, (for by what we are justified, by that we are pardoned; or by that righteousness our sins are covered)

vered) now that cannot be, for our less than due obedience cannot satisfy God for our disobedience. Or, 2. It were to make as if the imputing, or imputation of Christ's righteousness to Believers, would not have been sufficient for their Justification, unless that imputed Righteousness were eaked out for that purpose by our good works, as our good works had not been sufficient if they had not been eaked out with the righteousness of Christ. Now who dares to think that for God to have reckoned what Christ had done and suffered, as Mediator, to have been done and suffered for us, and in our behalf, had not been sufficient to have freed us from hell, and entitled us to eternal life? And if that alone be sufficient, why should we think that God hath added *Gospel Obedience* as a Partner with Christ in the justification of a sinner; or that we are justified partly by Christ's passive, and partly by our own active obedience? They that shall venture between those two stools will fall to the ground. Far be it from us to think that Christ hath died to make a Saviour of any thing, or of any body but himself. If God need do no more than reckon to us the satisfaction made to his Law, and Justice, by Christ our *Surety*, as if we had made it our selves, in order to his making us happy (with consistence to all his Attributes) why should we think that God doth call in the assistance of *Inherent Righteousness*, for, and towards the justifying of a sinner? *Frustra fit per plura*. He that saith, *If there had been a Law that could have given Righteousness,* verily

verily Righteousness should have been by that Law. Would he not say that the Righteousness of Christ imputed being alone sufficient for the Justification of a sinner, verily he shall be justified by that righteousness alone. *Internal* Righteousness is good for many other excellent purposes, though not to be the matter of our Justifying righteousness before God; as Gold and Silver are good for many things, though not to eat. Upon the whole matter I find Mr. *Sh.* (and as many more as are of his mind) highly peccant against the 11th Article of our Church, as to the first Proposition the em contained; viz. that *only for the merit of our Lord, and Saviour Christ, we are accepted righteous before God.* Concerning which Mr. *Rogers* (*the then Arch Bishops Chaplain,* and explainer of the Articles by Allowance) addeth, *And this is the Faith, and Confession of all the Churches Reformed.* The 2d Proposition contained in the 11th Article, according to Mr. *Rogers* his division of it, is this, *Only by Faith are we accounted righteous before God.* This branch of the Article seems to hold forth how, and by what means we become interestted in the merit of Christ, for which alone we are counted righteous before God, viz by *Faith*. But Mr. *Sh.* contradicteth that first Assertion two ways: 1. By saying in effect that we are justified as truly, and as much, by *Repentance, Love,* and every other Grace, as by *Faith*. For he makes *Faith* to be the Sum, and Substance of all Graces, as if every grace were *Faith*, and *Faith* were all graces in one. 2. By saying that we are justified,

justified or accounted righteous before God not only by *Faith*, but also by *Good Works*, which he calls *Faith*, or the *Righteousness of Faith*, witness, *Sh*. p. 273. where he saith, *That internal Holiness*, which they call the Righteousness of the Law, is that very righteousness of *Faith* which the Gospel commands. Now that Internal Holiness, he calls a conformity of heart and life to the *Moral Precepts*, which making to be the same thing with *Faith*, he strangely confounds *Faith* and *Good Works*, and makes them both one. In so doing he contradicteth the third Proposition contained in the Article which I am speaking of; viz. that *we are counted righteous before God not for our own works, or deservings*. In which words there is a manifest opposition made betwixt *Faith*, and *Good Works*, which Mr. *Sh* would have us take for one and the same thing. He makes as if *Faith*, and *Good Works* are all one, and so brings in Works into Justification; whereas the Article not only distinguisheth, but opposeth them, and so excludes Works from Justification. He that with reference to what hath been objected, can reconcile Mr. *Sh*'s. Tenets of Justification to the 11th Article of our Church, *erit mihi Magnus Apollo*. Now that the World may be sure that I have not mistaken the sense and meaning of the Church in this their 11th Article, I appeal to the *Homilies* before cited; and who knows not that the *Homilies* are the most genuine, and authentick Comment upon the Articles? (as the Prophets of the Old Testament were upon the

five

five Books of *Moses*.) and doubtless as the *Homilies* have stated the Doctrine of Justification; so the Article intended it. And therefore whosoever contradicts the *Homilies* in the point of Justification (as Mr. *Sh.* has done abundantly) must contradict the *Articles* also. After all this, I can hardly forbear to put forth such a Question to Mr. *Sh.* as *Dalilah* did to *Sampson*, Now tell me, I pray thee, wherewith thou mightest be bound? *Judg.* 15. 10. If neither the general current of Orthodox, and Famous Divines of the Reformed Churches; nor the unanimous consent of many renowned Bishops of the Church of *England*; nor the *Homilies*; nor the *Articles* of our Church; nor all together, can hold you; tell me, I pray thee, wherewith thou mayst be bound, and wherein thy great strength lieth.

CCVIII.

Considering how great, and manifold an interest the righteousness of Christ, which can be ours only by *Imputation*, has been proved to have in the business of justifying a sinner before God, their error, sin, and presumption must needs be great, who set themselves to oppose that righteousness, and the imputation of it. For it hath been proved that the Righteousness of Christ, is the *material cause* of our Justification, or the *matter* of our Righteousness before God; or that Righteousness by which, and with which, and upon the account of which believers are justified in God's sight. Also, that the Righteousness of Christ is the *Meritorious cause* of our Justification, or that Righteousness for which, or for the sake

sake of which, and by the merit and desert of which, Believers have their sins pardoned, and are accepted righteous to eternal life. It hath also been proved that the Righteousness of Christ is the *Formal cause* of Justification, if considered as *imputed*, or that the *imputation* of Christ his Righteousness is so; not that Believers are *formally* righteous with the righteousness of Christ, as a wise man is formally wise by his inherent wisdom; but for that they are as effectually saved from Hell, and accepted to eternal life upon account of what Christ hath done, and suffered for them, (which I call his Righteousness) as if they had a perfect compleat Righteousness inherent in themselves (whereby they were formally righteous in the strictest sense) with which to appear before God. I have also proved the Righteousness of Christ to be the great *Object* of that Faith which has been said to be the *Instrumental* cause of Justification, and that Faith is said to justify us only *correlatively* unto Christ Crucified, Christ fulfilling all righteousness for us, whose righteousness is apprehended, accepted, and applyed by Faith alone. That the righteousness of Christ is also the *Procatartical* cause of our Justification, or the great cause which doth move God, *ab extra* (or from without himself) in opposition to the *proegumenal*, or inwardly moving cause, *viz.* the Love, and good Will of God) to justify sinners; For thereunto is God moved by what Jesus Christ hath done, and suffered for them. *Forgiving one another (saith the Apostle) even as God for Christ;*

Christ's sake hath forgiven you, Eph. 4. 32. Lastly, From what hath been said may also be gathered that the exalting, or magnifying of the righteousness of Jesus Christ, or that the Infinite sufficiency, worth, and dignity of the Sacrifice and Satisfaction of Christ, and that the infinite Love and Mercy of God in providing such a Sacrifice, and such a righteousness for sinners, might be made known to the World. I say, that is one of the great *Ends*, or *Final causes* of God's justifying a believing Sinner. Witness Eph. 2. 7. *That in the Ages to come he might shew the exceeding riches of his Grace, in his kindness towards us through Christ Jesus.*

The righteousness of Christ being thus upon the matter all in all, in the business of *Justification*, not only the *material*, but the *formal*, the *Procatartical*, the *meritorious*, the *Final cause* of Justification (under several notions and considerations) it will follow that they who deny *Imputed* righteousness, and consequently the righteousness of Christ, which is thereby intended, do lay the Ax of their Error, to the very root of the Doctrine of *Justification* (almost the greatest Doctrine in all Christianity) and do threaten to cut it down, both Root and Branch. For take away the *Material*, *Formal*, *Meritorious*, *Procatartical*, *Final*, and *Instrumental* causes of Justification (for if the *object* of Faith, viz. the righteousness of Christ be taken away, the *Act* must needs cease; and so *Faith*, the *Instrument* of Justification, must fall to the ground.) I say, take away all these causes
of

of *Justification*, and what will remain? Scarce so much as were the remains of *Jezebel*, whom when they went to bury, 2 King. 9. 35. they found no more of her than the skul and the feet, and the palms of her hands, so that (as it was Prophefied by *Elijah*) they shall not say this is *Jezebel*; that is, they should not know her to be the same; or to allude to what is said of *Dagon*, in 1 Sam. 5. 4. And the Head of *Dagon*, and both the palms of his Hands were cut off upon the Threshold, only the stump of *Dagon* was left to him. So the opposers of Christ's imputed righteousness do leave scarce so much as a stump of the Doctrine of *Justification*.

And as it was said of *Dagon*, that he was fallen upon his Face to the ground, so the Adversaries of *Imputed* righteousness have laid the Doctrine of *Justification* flat upon its face, (as it were) so that according to them we cannot know it to be what it is, or say, *This is justification*. The righteousness whereby we are justified, and wherewith we are sanctified are so confounded, and made one and the same, the *Covenant of Works*, and the *Covenant of Grace* made so like each other, as to differ but in degree; one exacting a perfect, the other accepting an imperfect, sincere Obedience for our saving righteousness before God, *Protestant*, and *Popish* Doctrine so blended, or rather *Protestantism* (or what is so called) so conform'd to *Poper*y, so many of the main causes of *Justification* destroy'd at once; *Justification* so dwindled away to almost nothing to what had wont to be made

made of it, that we are in no small danger of becoming more corrupt than the Papists themselves in the great Doctrine of Justification: If the Enemies of Christ's imputed righteousness shall proceed at such a rate as Mr. *Sh.* has begun.

CCIX.

One good way to be established in the Doctrine of Christ's imputed righteousness, and preserved from the damnable errors afore said (for so I must call them) is to take heed how we deny the *Imputation*, or at leastwise the *Infection* and *Inherency* of *Original sin*. Be established in the belief of imputed sin, and you will never stagger at the Doctrine of *Imputed righteousness*. For who ever did deny the latter who did not first doubt the former? Now, the Infection or pollution of our Natures by Original Sin, me thinks is evident from this Argument, and Consideration amongst others. If we were not born in sin, and Conceived in Iniquity, we should have an indifferency to good or evil, no more propension to evil than to good, we should be as ductile, and pliable to what is good, as to what is evil, consequently, as we had more incentives from without, more inducements, more advantages, more helps and conduements to one than to the other, we should close with that, whether good, or evil. As a man that walks abroad for his pleasure, being perfectly indifferent which way he walks, East, or West; let a Friend come and desire him to go with

with him Eastward or Westward, that way that he desires him to go with him he will go, because before he was perfectly indifferent which way he went. He was like a pair of Scales hanging in *aquilíbrio*, in an equipoise, if but a grain or two be cast into either of them presently that Scale is turned; I say, the Scale is presently turned on that side, because before they were just even. So would it be with Men were they like to two even Scales, as to good and evil, neither of which did in the least preponderate (as they would Naturally be if there were no pollution by Original Sin) the least grain, or moment of reason, and of inducement cast in on either side would cause the Scale to turn on that side, had they ever so little more of Example, Counsel, Encouragement, Interest, or other Inducement to be, and to do good, than to be, and to do evil; they would certainly be, and do that which were good. But woful Experience tells us that it often proves quite otherwise. For how many Children have we seen and known, whose Parents from their very Child-hood have taken all possible care to ingage them in, and for the wayes of God, setting excellent Example before them, and suffering them to see no other, giving them the best Counsel they could, shewing them what was good, and what was not; the ugliness and danger of sin, the beauty and profitableness of Holiness, threatening and terrifying them in case they did amiss; yea, correcting of them now, and then, incouraging them by large promises if they did well, and by

○

frequent

frequent great rewards as oft as they found them well doing, giving them the best books to read, the best Company to keep, watching over them continually; and yet after all this, those Children, or some of them, have betaken themselves to ill courses, and run into all excess of riot, though Parents have done all that ever they could to keep down the Weeds of Sin, and to sow and cherish the Seeds of Virtue and goodness in them from time to time. If such Children had not been Naturally propense to evil, and averse to good, or propense to evil, and not to good, upon all those helps and advantages unto being good, they would certainly have prov'd so: It was therefore doubtless the Corruption of their Natures (otherwise called *Original sin*) which made them break all those bonds, and cast all those Cords from them, which would otherwise have held them to the performance of their Duty, and unto keeping Consciences void of offence towards God and Men. Never tell me that any man hath as much mind to do one thing as another, when a hundred times so much perswasion cannot prevail upon him to do the one, as will prevail upon him to do the other. When Scales are even, a few grains added to either of them, will cause that side to turn, and to weigh down: but where it is so that many *Ounces*, and *Pounds* will not cause one of the Scales to out-weigh the other, 'tis most certain they are not even, but one Scale doth much preponderate the other. Where ground is plain and level, the way backward
and

and forward are both alike easie, but when it is hard to go, and easie to come back, is a sign the ground is Hilly and uneven. Finding therefore that the doing of good is to men Naturally difficult and uneasie like going up a steep Hill, and that to do evil is easie to men, like coming down the Hill; 'tis manifest that the Nature of man is not indifferent to good and evil, but averse to good, and propense to evil. When Men presume to deny a thing so evident in the sight of Experience, as is the pollution of our Natures by Original sin, because they cannot satisfie themselves touching the way and manner how it is conveyed (as if men should deny that the River *Nilus* ever had any streams, or that there was ever such a River, because they could never find out it's Head) no wonder if they make bold also to deny what they never saw, and felt (as they have done the other) *viz.* the *Imputed* Righteousness of Jesus Christ. On the other hand, whosoever is duly sensible of the great pollution of his *Nature*, as well as of his *Life*, and of Original depravation as well as of defilement by actual sins, will cry out for the Robe of Christ's Imputed Righteousness to cover his manifold defects and deformities, and never dare to trust to such filthy rags as he finds his own Righteousness to be.

CCX.

There is so great a connection betwixt the Doctrine of Christ's *Satisfaction*, and that of *Imputed Righteousness*, and so great a depend-

ance of the latter upon the former, that whoever is hearty and stedfast in the belief of Christ's *Satisfaction*, or having made attonement and expiation for the sins of Believers by his blood, must either not understand *Consequences*, or be hearty also in the belief of the Mediator's *Righteousness* of Christ it's being *Imputed* to Believers, and their being justified before God upon that account, God looking upon them as having satisfied his Justice though not in their own Persons, yet in, and by Christ their *Surety*, and therefore pronouncing them discharged from guilt and righteous to Eternal Life. If Christ's Satisfaction be accepted of God for believers, and they accepted with God upon account thereof, then is his Satisfaction, or Righteousness *Imputed* to them, for that is the meaning of *Imputed*, as I have else-where explained. But if Christ's Satisfaction be not accepted of God for believers, or they accepted with God for it, then they are never the better for it, they have no real benefit and advantage by it. If a man pay a thousand pounds to another man's Creditor, to whom he owes as much as that comes to, but never tells him, that he pays that money on behalf of that other man, or would have him look'd upon to be now out of Debt, and to have given Satisfaction by his hand; I say, if such a thing be not expressed, he to whose Creditor that thousand pounds was paid, shall be never the better for it. Let no man take the boldness to deny *Imputed* Righteousness, or the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness

teousness to Believers, till he hath first acquired the impudence to deny the satisfaction of Christ also. For he that denies the former, do's by *consequence* (that is, in a mask and vizard) deny the latter also, which visibly, and with open face he is ashamed, or afraid to do.

CCXI.

The apprehension of approaching Death opens almost every man's eyes that professeth himself a Christian, to see the necessity of an *Imputed Righteousness*, even theirs who were ready to deride it whilst they lookt upon the evil day as far off. Bp. Dounam, in his book of *Justification*, p. 2003. tells us, *Many who have lived Papists, have in this most weighty point died Reformed Catholicks. And to this purpose* (saith he) *there is extant amongst them in divers Books, a Form of visiting the sick, wherein both the Pastor is directed what to say, and the sick person what to answer. The Pastor therefore having demanded these Questions. Brother, Dost thou rejoyce that thou shalt die in the Faith? Dost thou confess that thou hast not liv'd so well as thou oughtest? Doth it repent thee? Hast thou a will to repent if thou hadst space of life? Dost thou believe that our Lord Jesus Christ died for thee? Dost thou believe that thou canst not be saved but by his death? And having received affirmative answers to every Question, he inforceth this Exhortation, that while his soul remaineth in him, he should place his whole affiance in the death of Christ, and in no other thing: and that if God will judge him, if he shall say unto him, Thou art a*

O 3

sinner

sinner, that thou hast deserved damnation, that he is angry with thee, he should say; O Lord, I interpose the death of thy Son between me and thy judgment, between my sins and thee, between me and my bad deserts, between me and thine anger. So *Quaestiones auctore Anselmo morientibus proponi solita per universum Christianum orbem.* Bp. Usher, de Success. p. 194. & *Responsio ad Jesuitam*, p. 513. Chemnitius his *Examin*, part. I. p. 243. Card. Hosij *Confess. Petricoviens.* c. 74. fol. 143, &c. In the Edition Printed at Venice, there are these two Questions. Dost thou believe that thou shalt come to glory, not by thy own merits, but by the virtue, and merit of Christ's passion? And a little after, Dost thou believe that our Lord Jesus Christ died for our Salvation, and that no man can be saved by his own merits, or by any other means but by the merit of his passion? unto both which an Affirmative Answer was made. *Sic ordo baptizandi cum modo visitandi*, Impress. Venete. Anno 1575. fol. 34. See Perkins his *Reformed Catholick*. p. 276. Surely the truth of that Doctrine is much to be questioned, in which Papists themselves, though they instruct people the greatest part of their life time, yet dare not but teach them otherwise when they come to die.

CCXII.

Many have decry'd Imputed Righteousness, and professed to expect Salvation, or Justification, only by that righteousness which is *Inherent* in themselves, who yet have really and in good earnest had no *Inherent* Righteousness to pretend

tend to. In this number were the Pharises of old, who seemed to think themselves whole and not to stand in need of Christ for their Physitian, and yet God knows they were far from being so. For whilst they paid tithe of Mint, and Annise, and Cummin, they omitted the weightier matters of the Law; Judgment, Mercy, and Faith: Whereupon Christ cried out, *Woe unto you Scribes, and Pharisees. Hypocrites, &c. Mat. 23. 23. & Luke 20. 47.* Christ speaks thus of them: *Which devour Widdows houses, and for a pretense make long Prayers.* The Scribes, and Pharisees were great contemners of Christ's Righteousness, and pretendedly confident of their own, *God I thank thee* (said the Pharisee) *that I am not as other men are, or as this Publican: I fast twice in the week, I give tithes of all that I possess.* They boasted much of their own Righteousness; they were they *who justified themselves before men*, but in the mean time, being such as they were, they could not chuse but know that they had indeed, and in truth, no Righteousness to boast of.

CCXIII.

'Tis vehemently to be suspected that some men have made so much the higher pretences unto being justified by their own Righteousness because they knew they had no Righteousness of their own whereby to be Justified; so that their so doing was but a meer cloak, colour, and covert for their unrighteousness: as who should say, No man will suspect us to be unrighteous, or ungodly (though we know our selves so to be)

be) so long as we bear the world in hand that we have such confidence of our own Righteousness, that we expect, and desire no other Righteousness to Justifie us, that we need not fly for refuge (as others do) to that which they call *Imputed Righteousness*. As they who have no beauty, think themselves most concern'd to *paint*, thereby to conceal, and cover their deformities; so they are most prone to pretend to a Righteousness of their own, who have not the shadow of such a Righteousness to pretend to. A worthy Divine was heard to say, in his time, *That he would not for a thousand pounds have been ignorant of the Lives and Conversations of men whose manner it was to cry down the Righteousness of Christ Imputed, and to cry up their own Inherent Righteousness. For (saith he) I might possibly have been drawn into the same Error with them, if I had found their lives exactly good, but what I have known by them, or several of them, has perfectly delivered me, saith he, from that temptation.* He thought he had found the emptiest barrels in that respect, to give the greatest sound. It seems to be a maxime amongst some men, that The less they are what is good and excellent in truth and in reality, the more they ought to seem or to appear to be so.

CCXIV.

There is hardly any one thing represented in, and by the word of God, more dangerous and fatal, or destructive to the souls of men and women, than to trust, or to have trusted to their own

own righteousness, and not to the righteousness of Jesus Christ, which put to a believers account is call'd *Imputed Righteousness*. I wish that a few texts to that purpose might be well weighed by Mr. *Sherlock*, and others, viz. *Rom. 9. 33. Rom. 10. 3. Gal. 3. 10. Gal. 5. 2, 4. Rom. 11. 6. But Israel, which followed after the Law of righteousness, hath not attained to the Law of righteousness. Wherefore? Because they sought it not by Faith, but as it were by the works of the Law; for they stumbled at that stumbling stone, (viz. at Christ, and at the way of Justification, and Salvation by him.) For (Rom. 10. 3.) They being ignorant of God's righteousness; and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves to the righteousness of God. v. 4. For Christ is the end of the Law for righteousness to every one that believeth. See also Gal. 3. 10. For as many as are of the works of the Law (i. e. as expect to be justified by the works of the Law) are under the Curse. Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things that are written in the book of the Law to do them. Now it is the Moral Law that is here spoken of, and of which he saith, v. 11. But that no man is justified by the Law in the sight of God is evident, for the Just shall live by Faith. See also Gal. 5. 4. Christ is become of none effect to you, whosoever of you are justified by the law, ye are fallen from grace. That he cannot be justified by the grace of God, who expects to be justified by his own works (& if not by grace then not at all) seems evident as from the forementioned Texts, so likewise from *Rom. 11. 6. And if by Grace, then it is no**

more

*more of Works: otherwise Grace is no more Grace:
But if it be of Works, then it is no more Grace:
Otherwise Work is no more Work.*

CCX V.

The danger of going about to establish our own Righteousness in point of Justification being represented so very great, those Doctrines are vehemently to be suspected which look that way, as leading towards an Error: to which, what *Solomon* saith of a Harlot, may be allusively applyed, *Proverbs 7. 27. Her House is the way to Hell, going down to the Chambers of Death.* As also what is said *Proverbs 9. 18. He knoweth not that the dead are there, and that her Guests are in the depth of Hell.* I say, considering that, of this Error, as of the Strang Woman; it may be so said, the safest way will be to take that counsel concerning it, that *Solomon* gives concerning the path of the Wicked, and the way of Evil Men, *Prov. 4. 14, 15. Enter not into it, avoid it, pass not by it, turn from it, and pass away.*

Whilst we are all subject to Error (as we shall be in this life) it will be our wisdom, if we must Err at all, to be sure to Err on the safest side, where we shall not endanger being burned our selves, for razing the Foundation; but only having our work burned, for building Hay, and Stubble upon it. Now certainly it is better to ascribe too much to the Grace of God, and to the Righteousness of Christ, than too little; and
to

to attributte too little to our own Works,
and Righteousness, than too much. But I
hope I have done neither.

'Tis safer venturing to Err with *Puritans*,
such of them as have been great Assertors
of Justification by the Righteousness of Christ
Imputed, than to Err with *Papists*; who
use to oppose it in their Health, though ma-
ny of them have owned it upon their Death-
beds.

OF



O F

ACQUAINTANCE

WITH THE

PERSON of CHRIST:

*That there is such a Thing, and that
it is most desireable.*

THat we should not, or need not acquaint our selves with the *Law*, and *Gospel* of Christ, as well as with his *Person*; or that we ought to acquaint our selves with the Person of Christ, over, and above what is revealed concerning it in his *Gospel*, are two Assertions that, to the best of my knowledg, did never drop from the Mouth, or Pen, of any man that I have heard, or read: But that we ought to be acquainted not only with the *Law*, and *Gospel* of Christ, but also with his *Person*, is a great, and manifest Truth, which Mr. *Sh.* do's not only seem to doubt of, but laughs to scorn; at leastwise (which comes all to one) derides those (*ad nauseam usque*) who make any pretensions thereunto.

To

To know Christ (saith Mr. Sh. p. 37.) is to understand the Declaration which he hath made of God's Will to the World; that is, the Gospel which he Preached.

This he Writes *Exclusively*, as if that were the only knowledge of Christ which any man ought to seek after, and whatsoever more than that any man pretended to were but meer fancy and delusion. In p. 32. he saith, *God was seen in Christ. He that hath seen me hath seen my Father, that is, in plain words, the will of God was plainly declar'd to the World by Christ.* In p. 37. Mr. Sh. hath these words. *After this plain account wherein the knowledge of Christ consists (on which he had spent about twelve pages) the sum of which is that to know Christ is to understand his Gospel, which contains all those Revelations which he made of God's Will.* Now, if that be the sum total of all the knowledge of Christ, viz. *To understand all the Revelations which he hath made of God's Will*, then to know his Person is no part of that acquaintance with Christ which we ought to press after. If Dr. Owen had said that the sum of our knowledge of Christ is to know his Person, and that, after a long Discourse of *Acquaintance with Christ*, and wherein it did consist, you would, and justly might have charged him with rejecting Acquaintance with the *Laws*, and *Gospel* of Christ. But you have never found (nor I believe ever shall) Dr. Owen so gross, and erroneous as that would amount to. In p. 38. he saith, that those words, Col. 2. 3. *In him dwell all the treasures of*
Wisdom

Wisdom and knowledge, are meant of the Doctrines and Revelations of Christ. But why ought we not rather to understand them of his *Person*? When it is said, *Col. 2. 9. In him, that is, in Christ, dwelleth all the fulness of the God-head bodily*; and to like purpose, *Col. 1. 19. Ought we not to apply it to his Person*? When it is said, *Psal. 68. 18. Thou hast received gifts for men that the Lord might dwell amongst them*; is it not to be understood of his *Person*, not of his *Doctrines and Revelations*? Why then may not, *Col. 2. 3.* be also meant of the *Person* of Christ, especially considering those two Texts, *viz. 1 Cor. 1. 24. Christ the Power of God, and the Wisdom of God,* and *v. 24. Of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made to us Wisdom, &c.* both which Texts must necessarily be intended of the *Person* of Christ. He discovereth his inconsistency with himself in drawing a whole *Scheme of Divinity*, such as himself approveth, and after that saying; *p. 86. l. ult. All this we learn from our Acquaintance with Christ his Person.* If there be no such thing how comes he to draw a *Scheme of Divinity* after his own heart from thence? (of which he tells us again, *p. 96.*) But afterwards he insinuates that Acquaintance with the *Person* of Christ is a kind of *materia prima*, capable of all Forms, or a Nose of wax, that may be turned every way, or a Foundation on which we may build what we please, as well Error, as Truth; Truth, as Error, whereas I had thought the old Rule had been true, *viz. Posito uno absurdo sequuntur Mille*, or that nothing

thing but absurdities can well be founded upon absurdities ; but he it should seem can bring *a clean thing out of an unclean*, and cause Truth to be born of Error, his own supposedly Orthodox *Scheme of Divinity* to be founded upon the notion of *Acquaintance with the Person of Christ* ; for he saith, p. 97. *I must advise them to quit this way, as the which will serve others as well as themselves.* It is the Doctrine of Acquaintance with the *Person* of Christ that he would have men quit, but that he is greatly to blame for giving men that advice, I shall forthwith prove, *viz.* by the following Arguments.

1. If Jesus Christ be a *Person* then we ought to be acquainted with his *Person* (for we ought to acquaint our selves with what Christ is, so far as possibly we can.) But Jesus Christ is a *Person*. If Christ be not a *Person* there cannot be three Persons in the God-head, for they that own a Trinity in Unity, do all own Christ to be one (and the second) *Person* in the God-head, and if he were not one there were but two.

2. *Christ is the express Image of his Fathers Person*, Heb. 1. 3.

3. The Name Christ is but seldome in all the Bible put for the *Church*, and it is but seldome put for the *Law and Gospel of Christ*, and though you are pleased to say, p. 4. *That Christ is Originally the Name of an Office, which the Jews call the Messias, or one anointed by God* : Yet 'tis most certain that it is not in any one instance of Scripture the name of an *Office*. Now, there being but one more signification of the word Christ,

accor-

according to you, in all the Bible, viz. *A Person invested with an Office*, p. 8. That must needs be the usual, and general signification of the word *Christ*. Now, an *Office* is one thing, and an *Officer* is another thing, if *abstracts*, and *concrets*, be not the same thing, *Ex. gr.* if it be one thing to be *wise*, and another thing to be *wisdom* it self, or to be *good*, and to be *goodness* it self. If then the name *Christ* doth signifie a *Person invested with an Office*, then it signifies a *Person*, and something more, viz. one in *Office*; Yea, that being the most usual, and general signification of the name *Christ*, where something in the context doth not point out another signification of it, it ought alwayes to be taken in that sense, viz. for a *Person in Office*, or anointed to *Office*, one, or more, according to that known Axiom, viz. *Analogum per se positum sumitur pro famosiori analogato*, &c.

2. We ought to be acquainted with *Christ Himself*. Therefore with his *Person*. For the *Person* of *Christ* is (as you in your Book affirm more than once) *Christ himself* (as your own *Person* is your self.) Is it not of the *Person* of *Christ* that *St. Paul* speaketh, *Phil.* 3. 10. when he saith, *that I may know him, and the power of his Resurrection*, &c.

3. *Arg.* We ought to be acquainted with *Christ Crucified*; for, saith the Apostle, *1 Cor.* 2. 2. *I determined to know nothing amongst you save Jesus Christ, and him Crucified*, &c. Now surely it was the *Person* of *Christ*, not his *Law* and *Gospel* that was *Crucified*.

4. *Arg.*

4. *Arg.* We ought to be acquainted with Christ as he is God, or to know him to be such, and as he is such. But Christ as God is a *Person*, and was before ever he did assume the humane Nature. If we know not Christ to be God, how can we understand that Text, *Acts* 20. 28. *The Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own Blood?* Else how can we say to Christ, as *Thomas* did, *John* 20. 28. *My Lord, and my God?* •

5. *Arg.* We ought to know Christ as ~~Man~~, *God-man* or the Man *Christ Jesus*. Now Christ as *Man* is a *Person*, for his Humane Nature is taken into oneness of subsistence, or of Personality with the Divine Nature, which is called the *Hypostatical Union*.

5. *Arg.* We ought to be acquainted with the *Nature* and *Attributes* of Jesus Christ. Now it is impossible for us to know the *Attributes* of Christ his Divine Nature, unless we know his *Person*; for his *Attributes* are *himself*, as the Scripture saith, *God is Love*, and himself, and his *Person* (according to your self) are all one. Though I cannot demonstrate that *Decreta Dei sunt Deus ipse* (as some have said) nor answer their *Objections* against it, who say, that *God is Ens necessarium*, a Being which cannot but be, but his *decrees* are *Voluntary Acts*, and some of them at least might not have been, *Ex. gr.* God might not have decreed that Christ should dye for Sinners (for he was under no necessity to make such a decree) yet sure I am the *Attributes* of God, and consequently
P of

of God the Son, are God himself. God is Holiness it self, and Holiness in the abstract is God; and so God is power it self, and Power it self, or Infinite Power is God himself. If then we must be acquainted with the Attributes of Christ we must be acquainted with himself, and himself, and his Person are all one, as you your self have acknowledged once, and again.

6. *Arg.* We ought to be acquainted with Christ as he is represented to us in the Scriptures. But there Christ is represented to us as a *Person*. He speaks to his Spouse the Church as such throughout the *Canticles*, and she speaks to him as such, *Cant.* 1. 2. *Let him kiss me, &c. for thy Love is better than Wine, &c.* And v. 4. *The King hath brought me into his Chamber* (meaning Christ.) To mention all those places where Christ is spoken of as a *Person* were to transcribe a great part of the Bible. And for all that must we not pretend to, or seek after any acquaintance with his *Person*? Must we shut our eyes against a great part of what is spoken concerning Christ in the Holy Scriptures?

7. *Arg.* We ought to be acquainted with Christ as he is represented to us in the *Articles of our Creed*; But there he is represented to us as a *Person*. Witness these passages, *And in Jesus Christ our Lord, who was Conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was Crucified, dead and Buried, descended into Hell, rose again the third day, ascended up to Heaven, sitteth at the right hand of God,*

God, from thence he shall come to judge the *Quick and the Dead*. Now, the fore-mentioned Expressions are applicable only to his *Person*, not to his *Law* and *Gospel*, and therefore we ought to be acquainted with the *Person* of Christ, if we ought to know, and believe the one half (for thereabouts they are) of the *Articles* of our *Creed*.

8. *Arg.* We ought to be acquainted with the *Person* of God the Father, and therefore also with the *Person* of God the Son. For there is the same Reason for both. What but the *Person* of God the Father, and of the two other Persons of the Blessed Trinity is meant, *Job* 22. 21. where 'tis said, *Acquaint thy self with him, and be at peace?* By *Him* cannot be meant the *Law*, and *Gospel* of God, witness *v.* 22. *Receive, I pray thee, the Law from his mouth:* what, the *Law* from the mouth of his *Law*? What sense were that? and *v.* 23. *If thou return to the Almighty thou shalt be built up, &c.* It was the Almighty then, by which is meant God himself, with whom he was counselled, *v.* 21. to acquaint himself, for of the same Person he speaks in these three verses, &c.

9. *Arg.* We ought to have, and to hold *Communion*, and *Fellowship*, with Christ himself, or with the *Person* of Christ, : *Ergo*, we ought to be acquainted with his *Person*. *Fellowship*, and *Acquaintance* cannot easily be separated. *Acquaintance*, if it doth not precede *Society*, and *Fellowship* betwixt man, and man, it do's always accompany it, or follow upon it. For how

can we otherwise chuse than be acquainted with the Persons of those with whom we have intimately conversed time after time? I must needs know such a one, say we, having conversed with him so often as I have done, &c. Now Fellowship, and Communion with the Person of Christ, or with Christ himself we all ought to seek after; for we cannot walk in the light, but we must have it, 1 *John* 1. 7. and walk in the light, viz. of Grace, and Holiness we ought, and must: and of such St. *John* saith v. 3. *And truly our fellowship is with the Father, and the Son Christ Jesus.* What with his Law and Gospel only? as by reading, and hearing, and understanding of it? All that wicked men may do, and have. Therefore with himself doubtless, or with his Person, in, and by means of his Ordinances. Read *Psal* 63. 1. *O God, thou art my God, early will I seek thee, my soul thirsteth after thee.* v. 2. *To see thy power and thy glory so as I have seen thee in thy Sanctuary.* So that God himself is to be sought, yea to be seen and enjoyed in his Ordinances. Read also *Exod.* 25. 22. *And there will I meet with thee, and commune with thee from above the Mercy-seat, from between the Cherubims which are upon the Ark of the Testimony of all things which I give thee in commandment, &c.* See also *Exodus* 20. 24. *In all places where I record my name I will come unto thee, and I will bless thee, &c.* May we not infer that Communion which Believers have, and ought to have with Christ himself in Ordinances, from *Rev.* 1. 13. ? *And in the midst of the seven Candlesticks one like*

to the Son of Man, &c. To name but one text more for this purpose, in *Mat. 18. 20.* saith our Saviour, *Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.* From all these places I gather that *Communion* with the Person of Christ may be had, and is promised upon certain conditions; and from thence I infer, That Acquaintance with the person of our Saviour (which is an inseparable concomitant or consequent of such communion) may be had also, and ought to be sought after, &c.

Surely I need say no more (nay have said more than I did need) to convince any man that he has done very sinfully in disowning, and deriding so real, and sacred a thing, as is *Acquaintance with the Person of Christ*, though under pretence of zeal for his Law and Gospel. Now whereas I find these two words, *viz. the Law & Gospel* of our Saviour often put together in Mr. Sh's. book, as if the latter did signifie more than the former, give me leave to observe by the way, that one of them might be spared: for they are one and the same in sense, and signification, for that the *Gospel* of Christ is his *Law*; and the *Law* of Christ is his *Gospel*: For the Gospel of Christ is not all made up of *Promises*, but partly of *Precepts*. Was it not the sum and substance of the *Gospel*, or *Covenant of Grace*, which Paul and Silas answered to the Jailor, *Acts 16. 30.* who asked them, *Sirs, what must I do to be saved?* v. 31. *Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved.* The *Covenant of Grace*, as well as other Covenants, is *Promissum sub condi-*

siane, it consists as well of a *Law* enjoining a *Duty*, as of a *Promise* encouraging thereunto. Neither is the *Law* of Christ without the *Promise*, nor the *Promise* of Christ without his *Law*, but they go both hand in hand together. Therefore we read of those *who obey not* (as well as *who believe not*) *the Gospel of Christ* : now a *Law* is the object of disobedience, *where no Law is there can be no Transgression* : as where there is no promise there can be no Diffidence or unbelief, &c. I have said enough, I think, to prove that the *Law*, and *Gospel* of our Saviour are ~~synonymous~~ or Synonymous expressions: but having been guilty of *Substraction* in other passages of his book (even to such a degree as to subtract, or deny Acquaintance with the Person of Christ) who knows whether to make amends for that, he has not here run upon *Multiplication* more than he needed to have done, like the Papists, who presuming to take away one of the ten Commandments, *split* another single Commandment into two, that still they may make up the same number. But if I do not overlook greater faults than *Tautologies* in the Book that I am dealing with, I think I shall never have done with it. My next work shall be to prove that *Acquaintance with the Person of Christ* (which our unhappy Antagonist has so often let fly against) is not only a real, and attainable thing, but also greatly *desireable*, yea, and highly *advantageous*, and upon what grounds it is so.

First, Acquaintance with the person of our Saviour is to be desired in order to enkindling, and

and encreasing Love and Affection in us towards him. *Ignoti nulla Cupido.* We may love Christ though we never saw him, but we cannot love him if we never knew him. *Thy name is as Ointment poured forth,* Cant. 1. 3- *therefore do the Virgins love thee;* implying, that if the name of Christ had been as ointment close shut up in a Box, and not discovering it self, either by sight, or savour, they could not have loved him. When Ointments send forth their savour, we know what they are. Now saith the Text, *Because of the savour of thy good Ointment therefore do they love thee,* Cant. 1. 3. As they say *There is nothing in the understanding that was not first in the senses:* it is as true, *There is nothing in the affections, that was not first in the understanding.* If then we ought to love the Person of Christ, for certain we ought to acquaint our selves with his Person, and not with his Gospel only, or rather with that part of his Gospel only, which makes no mention of his Person. Who dares to say that the Person of Christ ought not to be delighted in, yea that it is nor a greae duty to delight our selves in the *Person*, and Personal excellencies of our Saviour? If so I am sure we ought to be acquainted therewithal; for to delight in that whereof we are perfectly ignorant, is utterly impossible.

Delighting, and rejoycing are neer akin: they seem to differ but in degree. Now that it is a duty to rejoyce in Christ Jesus may be gathered from sundry texts, viz. *Phil. 3. 1, 3.* and *Phil. 4. 4. Rejoyce in the Lord always, and again I say rejoyce:*

joyce: viz. in the Lord Christ; for that he is meant may, be collected from the next verse, viz. *The Lord is at hand*. But how can we rejoyce in one we know not, or with whom we have no acquaintance? *In whom believing* (saith the Scripture) *we rejoyce*: intimating that we could not rejoyce in Christ unless we knew him. For, saith the Apostle, *How shall they believe on him of whom they have not heard?* Whose doubt is it whether it be our duty and excellency to set a high price, and value upon Christ? Is it not said that *to them that believe Christ is precious?* Yea, is it not as distinguishing a Character of a true Believer as can be given, that he is one that valueth Jesus Christ above all the world, even then when he has fair opportunities to enjoy abundance of the World, and great probability that he may long continue so to do? Is not the *Merchant man* spoken of *Mat. 13.45*. *Who when he had found one Pearl of great price, went and sold all that he had, and bought it*, an emblem of every true Christian setting forth the high esteem, and value for Christ, which every such person hath? If so, It must needs be a great privilege to be endowed with power from on high to prefer Jesus Christ above our greatest joys, and enjoyments in this world. Now that we can never do unless we be acquainted with him. We can value no man till we know him, and his worth. To one that knows the worth of a barley corn, but not of a Jewel; a Jewel may seem less worth than a barley-corn. The Daughters of *Jerusalem* hearing the Church say that *she was sick*
of

of Love, to Christ, made answer, *What is thy Beloved more than another Beloved?* But the Spouse that was acquainted with the Person of Christ, replied; *My Beloved is white and ruddy, the chiefest amongst ten thousand,* and so continueth to commend him to the end of that Chapter. Whence did that prizing and admiring of the Person of Christ result but from her having that Acquaintance with him which others had not? (who were ready through their Ignorance to say, *He hath no Form, nor Comeliness, there is no Beauty that we should desire him.*) Christ to the Jews that knew him not was a *stumbling block,* and to the Gentiles *foolishness,* but unto them which were called, (viz. to the saving knowledge of himself) *Christ the Power of God and the Wisdom of God.*

A Fourth Priviledge resulting from our Acquaintance with the *Person* of Christ is, that thereby we shall be induced, and I had almost said inforced to trust him; For they that know Christ as they ought to know him cannot chuse but trust him. As there are some Truths which the mind of a man cannot chuse but assent to, at the first hearing, which do *Cogere Assensum*, so there are, some such indisputable objects of Love, and Trust, that they who know them to be what they are cannot but Love, and trust them. Such a one is Christ. *They that know thy Name will trust in thee.* Now, not the Word and Promises, but the Person of Christ is the *first* Object of our trust, and the *reason* of our trust: for what is the reason that we trust any mans word, but because

cause we know himself to be honest, and able to make it good? Who regards the Promise of a meer Stranger, not knowing who is, or as they say, whence he comes, and whether he will? *Paul* therefore trusted Christ with the invaluable Jewel of his Soul, because he was well acquainted with him, 2 *Tim.* 1. 12. For, saith he, *I know whom I have believed, and am perswaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed to him against that day.* Who would lose the benefit of being able cheerfully to commit his Soul into the hands of Christ, for all Eternity, to excuse the Labour, and pains of being acquainted with him? Or what wise man would intrust any matter of great concernment in the hands of one whom he has no knowledge?

To pass on to a *Fifth*. Is it no Priviledge that by how much more we know the Person, and Personal Excellencies of Christ, by so much more shall we know how to please, and imitate him? We cannot but please Christ when we imitate, and conform to him. Now, the knowledge of Christ is a *conforming*, or rather *transforming* knowledge, 2 *Cor.* 3. 18. *We all with open face, as in a Glass beholding the Glory of God, are changed into the same Image.* If we see Christ as he is, we cannot but be like him, 1 *John* 3. 2. A full Vision of Christ will fully assimilate us to him, and so will a more imperfect Vision, or knowledge of him, in a degree. The more we know the temper, and disposition of any Friend, the better we know how to suit and accommodate our selves to him, and how to give him

him content. 'Tis both our Duty and Excellency to conform to the will and Pattern of our Saviour, *to walk as he walked; and to be in the world as he was in the World,* 1 John 4. 17. and that we can never do, unless we know who he was, and how he behav'd himself when he was in this World. He that would *learn of Christ* (as he bids us) *to be meek and Lowly*, must first be acquainted with Christ as such, or know assuredly that he was so.

Sixthly, By acquaintance with the Person of Christ, or with Christ himself (which you have told us comes all to one) we may come to know the *Image of Christ*, where, and in whomsoever we shall see it, and thereby be induced to love, and honour both it, and them. St. John did find it a great advantage to himself and others, that they did know and love the *Image of Christ* where they saw it. For, saith he, 1 John 3. 14. *We know that we have passed from Death to Life, because we love the Brethren;* meaning, such in whom the Image, and likeness of Christ did appear. Who can Love and value a Copy for it's likeness to the *Original*, unless he be acquainted with the *Original* to which it is like? If one man imitate another as exactly as he can, in Preaching, or otherwise, who can love him for so doing, unless he know, and prize the Person whom he imitates?

Seventhly, Mr. Sherlock himself seems to account it a great Duty, and Priviledge, to be acquainted with the Gospel of Christ. Now, who knows not that it is impossible to be acquainted

quainted with the *Person* of Christ, and the circumstances of his *Person*, viz. *Life, Death, Resurrection, &c.* and not to be acquainted with a great part of his *Gospel*, sith a great part of the *Gospel* is taken up in describing to us who Christ was, what he did, and suffered; and for what ends, and purposes he did and suffered such things?

Eighthly, Yea, more than so, Acquaintance with the *Person* of Christ doth not only imply, and involve acquaintance with a great part of his *Gospel*, but hath also a great tendency and influence both to *awe*, and *allure* us to the Obedience thereof. The knowledge of Christ as the Judge of Quick, and Dead, who will one day come in flames of Fire to take Vengeance on them who obey not his *Gospel*, may awe us into Obedience, as the Apostle speaks, *2 Cor. 5. 11. Knowing therefore the terror of the Lord, we persuade men.* He had said in the verse immediately fore going, *For we must all appear before the Judgment-seat of Christ, &c.* And sith *Mercy* and *Majesty* do both meet in Christ, and greet each other, surely there is much in that knowledge of his *Person*, as well to *invite*, and *allure*, as to *awe*, and affright us into the Obedience of his *Gospel*. Else what meaneth that obtestation of the Apostle, *Rom. 12. 1. I beseech you therefore, Brethren, by the Mercies of God that ye present your Bodies a Living Sacrifice, Holy, acceptable to God, &c.*

Ninthly, Acquaintance with the *Person* of Christ according to what is revealed concerning

it in his Gospel (and no man that Mr. Sh. writes against pretends to any other) will Antidote us against those gross Errors, and Heresies which many have run into, as in reference to the Person of our Saviour, as *Simon Magus, Cerinthus, Marcion, Samosatenus, Arius, Nestorius*, and such like; whereof some denyed his *Divinity*, others his *Humanity*; some the *Purity* of his Conception, others the truth of it: some confounded the two Natures, denying their distinction, others denying their *Union*, divided the Person, of one making two. Some said he hath the *Body*, but not the *Soul* of Man; others, that he took an *Ethereal*, or Spiritual, not a true Body, and such like. They are seconded at this day by *Amitrinitarians, Familists, Socinians, &c.*

An effectual Antidote against *Quakerism* is, I think, as necessary at this day as such an one against the *Plague* would have been some years since: and certainly a due Acquaintance with the *Person* of Christ, and stedfast belief of what the Scripture saith concerning the *Person* of our Saviour, is as Sovereign an Antidote against the Pestilent Doctrines of the *Quakers* as can be made use of. For who can be a *Quaker* (truly so called) who doth really believe what the Scripture hath revealed to us, as touching the *Person* of Christ? As namely, that Jesus Christ is not a meer *Quality, Accident, or Principle*, or nothing else but *the Light* which is *within* every man, but a *real Person*, true God, and true Man, and that the Gospel is a real *History*, and true

true matter of Fact in the Letter of it, as well as a profound *Mystery*, with reference to the wise contrivance, and Excellent designs, and uses thereof? The *Quakers* (like the *Fanaticists* of old) turn the whole *History* of the Gospel, so far as concerns the Person of Christ into an *Allegory*, and by endeavouring to make nothing but a meer *Figure* of it, do make it a meer *Cypher*. Before I go any further I must take leave to tell Mr. *Sh.* that the course he takes is the Highway to *Quakerism*. For if men shall be derided for making mention of the *Person* of Christ, and wheresoever the name of Christ is found we shall generally be directed to understand thereby either the *Church*, or certain *Laws and Rules*, or above and before all, a certain Office (one, or more) how soon may the subtiler sort of *Quakers* tell us that there is but a step betwixt us and them, they can easily give us the Right hand of fellowship? They say that the *Light* of Nature, or Light within us (which is a great Law, or System of Laws) that is Christ. They say that *Conscience* (that great Office, and Court of Judicature set up in every mans breast) that is *Christ*, and we (if of Mr. *Sherlock's* mind) do say that *Christ* is primarily, and Originally the name of an Office. They say that Christ and we are all one, for every man is one and the same with the Light that is in him (for that Light is something of our selves) and we say that Christ for the most part signifies either the *Church*, whereof our selves are a part, or certain *Laws and Rules* of Life, and such is the

Light

Light within us, or is the name of an Office, and has not the Light within us several Offices, as namely to accuse, or excuse; to condemn, or acquit, and comfort us, as the matter shall require, &c.

Thus whilst every thing almost that is said of Christ himself, we do interpret to belong to his *Law* and *Gospel*, and do generally read the latter instead of the former (as if it were so in our Bibles) we shall be apt to forget that there is any such *Person*, as Christ, and what that person has done and suffered for us, and be in a great preparedness to comply with the *Quakers*, who retain in effect nothing but the name of Christ, by which name they baptize, and intend nothing but the *Light within them*, or the *Law* of Nature. Could the grosser sort of *Quakers* but extirpate the History and Doctrine of the *Person* of Christ, and bury them in perfect oblivion: I doubt not but they would think the greatest part of their work were done, and then the Light of Nature might easily be set upon the Throne of Christ, and be generally accepted for the only Light that men should turn to.

Tenthly, *Fellowship and Converse* with Jesus Christ is doubtless a great privilege, for so St. *John* speaks of it, 1 *John* 1. 3. and there is no question to be made but that Communion and Fellowship with Christ is, and may be much facilitated, and farthered, by our Acquaintance with his Person. We scarce know how to converse with those to whom we are yet but strangers; we hardly know what is fit and proper for us to
say

say to them, or how to take and construe such things as they speak to us ; whether they speak as they think, or only to trye us, or whether they take in good part what we say to them. But when we discourse those persons with whom we are intimately acquainted, we have as it were a Key to all they say ; we easily understand their meaning if they say but a little, and can apply our selves to them with freedom and confidence. They who are well acquainted with dumb persons, can understand their very *signs*, and motions, better it may be, than the particular words, and expressions of those whom they never saw before.

Again, Acquaintance with the *Person* of Christ is as it were a door, an inlet to all sorts of Graces, as namely, *Faith, Love, Humility, Repentance, Self-denial, Patience*, and what not ? Faith in Christ is called *Knowledge*, Isa. 53. 11. *By the knowledge of him shall he justifie many*, and so elsewhere, probably because it is introduced by, and founded in the knowledge of Christ. Of *Love*, and *delight* in Christ, springing from thence I spake before. To prove it will teach us *Humility*, I might alledge what *Job* saith to God *Now mine eyes have seen thee, therefore do I abhor myself in dust and ashes* : also those words of Christ, *Learn of me, for I am meek and lowly*. If the knowledg of Christ doth not promote *Repentance*, why is it said, *They shall see him whom they have pierced, and mourn over him* ? To know Christ to have been oppressed and afflicted, yet he *opened not his mouth, as a sheep before the shearers*

is dumb, &c. Isa. 58. 7. *Who when he was reviled, reviled not again, when he suffered he threatened not,* 1 Pet. 2. 23. Is it not a great Instance and lesson of *Patience*? when the Apostle saith, Phil. 2. § 6. *Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus, who being in the form of God, made himself of no Reputation, and took upon him the form of a Servant, and became obedient, even to the Death of the Cross;* do's he not set before us the highest Example of *Self-denial* that ever was? The like might be said of all other graces how they may be learnt by a due Acquaintance with Christ. Take one or two Texts for all, 2 Pet. 1. 2. *Grace and Peace be multiplied to you through the knowledge of God, and of our Lord Jesus Christ.* What more full Expression than that of our Saviour, John 17. 3. *This is Life Eternal, that they might know thee and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent.* intimating that a right knowledge of God, and Christ, is *seminally, virtually, and radically*, all Grace, and all that is necessary in order to Glory, &c.

Now, do all these great benefits and privileges result from a right knowledge of the Person of Christ, and dare any man be so bold (I had almost said so desperate) as to laugh it to scorn? But Mr. Sh. tells us, p. 57. of a very bad scheme of Divinity (as he counts it) drawn from the Doctrine of Acquaintance with the Person of Christ, of which in his jarring Language he saith, *These are those great Gospel Mysteries, and Soul saving Truths which are learnt from an Acquaintance with Christ's Person, which his*

Q

Gospel

Gospel is silent in. But how inconsistent is he with himself? For he has no sooner ended that *mock scheme*, which he puts upon those whom he writes against, but he forthwith gives you another of his own, as sound (to his thinking) as sound can be, which he saith, *is much more plainly deducible from an Acquaintance with Christ's Person*, p. 81. How can that Doctrine be in it's self despicable, false, and dangerous, from whence a whole System, or Scheme of good Divinity may be drawn? St. James saith, *Jam. 3. 12. One Fountain cannot send forth salt waters and fresh.* But Mr. Sh. has brought first Salt Waters, as he counts them, and then fresh, and both out of the same Fountain, *viz. Acquaintance with the Person of Christ.* They had wont to say, *Can any good come out of Nazareth?* But with much more reason it may be said, Can a fanisful imaginary Doctrine, such as he often intimates that of Acquaintance with Christ's Person to be, yield so many great Truths, as Mr. Sh. undertakes to infer from thence? for he saith, p. 87. *All this we learn from an Acquaintance with Christ's Person (as these men call it)* and then he adds (judge you how humbly) *And it were easie now to draw the whole Plot and design of Christianity, to search into the deep counsels of God, and to discover those Principles and Motives he was Acted by, and the Infinite Wisdom of the contrivance and the true methods of a sinners recovery by Christ, and what that Homage and Worship is which we owe our Saviourr.*

Now, if it be so, that all these great, and excellent

cellent Truths Mr. Sh. hath learnt, and could discover from *Acquaintance with Christ's Person*, adding (*as they call it*) never I think was a Doctrine so confessedly pregnant, and able instrumentally to lead a man into all truth, *even into the deep counsels of God, and the Infinite wisdom of his contrivances* (*as he phraseth it*) so kickt, and spurn'd at, so scorn'd and derided, as *Acquaintance with Christ's Person* has been by one that tells us he has learnt, and could discover so much from it. Admit some men should, or had drawn a *bad Scheme of Theology*, from a great, and wholsom truth (*as foul stomachs corrupt the best of nourishments, and the very grace of God it's self is by some turned into wantonness*) was it Lawful for Mr. Sh. to expose that great Truth, to scorn, and contempt, because others had so perverted it? (*as some are said to wrest some passages in St. Paul's Epistles, to their own destruction.*) By the same reason might he not go about to raze the only Foundation, our Lord *Jesus Christ*, because some even upon that have *built Hay and Stubble*. Had not Mr. Sh. prevented me by giving a *Scheme of Divinity*, of his own approving, deducible, as he tells us, from *Acquaintance with Christ's Person*, I could easily have given him another, such as I think he would not have offered to deny, the Truth, and goodness, either of the whole, or of any part thereof. I would have premised but two or three things, *viz.* 1. That Mr. Sh. by that *Acquaintance with the Person of Christ*, for pretending to which he derides those

whom he writes against, understands acquaintance with the *Circumstances*, and *adjuncts* of the Person of Christ; as namely, with his *Life*, *Death*, *Resurrection*, *Ascension*, *Intercession*, as well as with himself immediately, for that appeareth, not only from p. 139, and 140. (where he exposeth men for being so much transported sometimes with the thoughts of *Christ Crucified*) other whiles with the apprehension of his Love to them, but more especially from that *Scheme of Divinity* which himself deduceth from Acquaintance with Christ's Person; beginning p. 81. and reaching to p. 87. where he first treats of Christ his *Incarnation*, or coming into the World in the Nature of Man. Then he treats of the *good works*, and kind *Miracles* which he wrought in the World. Then he mentions the *World being made by Christ*. Afterwards he speaks of the *Innocence*, and *Holiness* of his *Life*, of his *Excellent Example*. By and by, he mentions Christ his dying as a sacrifice for sin. Then he speaks of Christ his *Resurrection* from the dead, and his *Ascension to Heaven*, p. 86. Of his *Exaltation to the right hand of God*, and of his *Intercession*. All these things he refers to our Acquaintance with Christ's Person, adding (as these men call it) nay, it is easie to shew that he doth also thereunto refer Acquaintance with the *Divine*, as well as *Humane Nature of Christ*, and with the *several Excellencies*, and *perfections* of both his *Natures united in one Person*. For v. 82. saith he, *when we consider this Mediator was no less than the Eternal son of God, by whom the worlds*

Worlds were made ; (which words he brings into his discourse of *Christs Person*, &c.) Now if to be acquainted with *Christs Person*, be to be acquainted with his *Incarnation*, *Life*, good *Works*, *Death*, *Resurrection*, *Ascension*, and *Intercession*, yea with his *Divine Nature*, and the several *Excellencies* and *Perfections* thereof, I dare be bold to say it were a very easie thing, from all of these put together, to deduce all the *Articles of our Creed*, the *Doctrine of a Deity*, and of a *Trinity in Unity*, of the *Divine Attributes*, of *Creation*, *Providence*, and of all the great things which are revealed concerning Christ, as he was *Man*, of the *Church*, and of the *Communion of Saints* (for knowing Christ to be Head of the Church, I must know there is a *Church* that hath Communion amongst the several Members of it, as members of the Natural Body have each with other) Moreover, the *Doctrine of Forgiveness of sins*, of the *Resurrection of the Dead*, and of the *Life Everlasting* : Yea, a man cannot have so much knowledge of the *Person* of Christ, but he must needs know the substance of the *Ten Commandments*, and that he ought to conform thereunto ; for he that knows how Christ walked, knows that Christians ought to walk as they have had him for an example, who loved God with all his heart, and his Neighbours (if men may so be called) as himself.

Now if *Acquaintance with Christ his Person*, according to that Description which Mr. Sh. himself doth make of it, do take in so great a

part of the most indisputable Divinity that we have; viz. the sum of the *Creed*, and *Decalogue*, who can but wonder at the extreme folly, and wickedness of any man, that should presume to write one line in contempt thereof? Had there been a generation of men who had pretended to have known the *bodily personage of Christ*, his *Statue*, *Complexion*, *Features*, &c. or to have had such a vision of Christ as *Stephen*, *Acts 7. 55.* *Who looking up to Heaven, saw Jesus sitting at the right hand of God*, or to have conversed with the person of Christ face, to face (as some have pretended to have done with Angels) to have exposed such wild Enthusiasts as those, for their vain pretences, had been but to have serv'd them in their kind, and such a rod as you have made might have suited well enough with the backs of such fools: But to fall foul upon men for pretending, at leastwise to desire, and to press after those things which every good Christian ought to desire, and press after, and cannot do otherwise; viz. to *know Jesus Christ himself*, and him *Crucified*, and rising again from the dead, yea to *know the power of his death, and of his Resurrection*, as *St. Paul* speaks, *Phil. 3. 9.* was so daring an attempt, and so malicious an enterprize, as I have seldom heard the like. Had the men you write against press'd their hearers, and readers to a meer *speculative* knowledg of Christ, only to fill their heads with *notions* concerning the nature, and excellencies of Christ, you might have blam'd them for that: But 'tis an *experimental* knowledg of Christ, which you
your

your self do confess, these men pretend, and press to, p. 139. for there you say, *So these men talk also of an Experimental knowledge of Christ, the meaning of which is that this Acquaintance with the Person of Christ, warms and heats their fancies, sometimes they find great breakings of heart, &c.* The men you write against do press men so to know Christ, as to know him, is said, *to be Life Eternal*. They would be understood as Divines say the Scriptures should be, when they use words of knowledge, *verba notitia connotant affectum*, viz. to co-signifie suitable affections: They mind men of such Texts as those, 1 Joh. 2. 3. *Hereby we do know that we know him, if we keep his Commandments*: And v. 4. *He that saith I know him, and keepeth not his Commandments, is a liar*. And 1 Joh. 3. 6. *Who-soever sinneth hath not seen him, neither known him*. Now to abuse Reverend Ministers for pressing men to a practical, experimental, affectionate knowledge of the *Incarnation, Life, Death, Resurrection, Ascension, and Intercession* of Christ, and of his great *Personal Excellencies*, both *Divine and Humane*, was a thing so bordering upon *Blasphemy*, that hardly any thing can come nearer to it. There are two Errours more that I should be glad to convince Mr. *Sherlock* of e're I conclude this Chapter; one is, that it was not *Acquaintance with the Person of Christ* that he should have expos'd more or less, (for that is a Sacred and most necessary thing) but he should have reprov'd the professed *rejecters*, and *refusers* of acquaintance with the

Laws and Gospel of Christ : He should have said, Here come they who say unto Christ, *This man shall not Reign over us. Come, let us break his Bonds, and cast his Cords from us.* Here come they who say unto God, *Depart from us, we do not desire the knowledge of thy ways.* You should have remembered, that *Christ will come in flames of fire to take vengeance on them that know not God*; and therefore should have found fault with them *that obey not the Gospel of Christ*, not with them who stir up themselves and others to know Christ, yea his *Person*; for of that *Paul* speaks, when he saith, *that I may know him, and the Power of his Death, &c.* You have plainly set the Saddle upon the wrong Horse, and must take more heed another time. Lastly, Mr. *Sh.* hath built all his long Discourse about *Acquaintance with the Person of Christ*, upon a false and sandy Foundation, viz. a meer Dream of his own; as if Dr. *Owen* did go about to set up a *Religion of the Person of Christ*, in opposition to the *Religion of his Law and Gospel*; which I dare say never entered into his heart to do, nor can any such thing, with any colour of reason, be gathered from those two passages, viz. *Sh.* p. 38, and 39. from whence Mr. *Sh.* commenceth two long Suits against Dr. *Owen*, giving him in the first place this Ironical Salute, *I shall not envy the Author the glory of this Discovery, and therefore shall honestly confess where I had it, viz. in a Book entitled Communion with God, &c.* Written by John Owen, D. D. &c.

Now

Now they that shall impartially read those two passages quoted out of *J. O.* his Book of *Communion with God*, upon which *Mr. Sh.* chargeth him with setting up a *Religion of Christs Person*, in opposition to the *Religion of his Doctrine*, may easily see, that the *Premises* which *Mr. Sh.* produceth, will by no means bear the *Conclusion* which he draws from thence, or prove *Dr. O.* guilty of any such Errour as he chargeth him with; but as the Proverb saith, *There is a great deal of Cry, and but a little Wooll.* The first passage in *Dr. J. O.*'s Book, of which he makes so much use, is this: *Christ is not only the Wisdome of God, but made Wisdom to us, not only by teaching us wisdom, as he is the great Prophet of the Church, but also because by the knowing of him we become acquainted with the wisdom of God, which is our wisdom.* Thus far *Dr. O.* p. 87. Now what hurt in all this? At this great offence is taken by *Mr. Sh.* but I see none given. That *Christ is the wisdom of God*, and not only so, but *made to us of God wisdom*, is the very expression of the Holy Ghost in Scripture, *1 Cor. 1. 30.* That *Christ* teacheth us *Wisdom*, as he is the great Prophet of the Church, is no Christians doubt. Therefore the only words that have raised all this clamour are these: *but also because by the knowing of him we become acquainted with the Wisdom of God.* Here *Mr. Sh.* takes it for granted that by *him* is meant the *Person* of *Christ*, though the word *Person* is not once used in all this condemned passage: and though *Mr. Sh.* himself when he finds the word *Christ*, doth generally

nerally construe it to mean the *Laws and Gospel of Christ*, not his *Person*. Suppose we then that the *Person* of Christ was there intended by Dr. J. O. What false Divinity, or what bad sense is there, in saying, that by knowing the *Person* of Christ, we become acquainted with the *Wisdom* of God? I am bold to say that Acquaintance with the *Person* of Christ is one way to become acquainted with the *Wisdom* of God: and Dr. O. saith no more: for he saith, *Christ is made Wisdom to us, not only by teaching us Wisdom, as he is the great Prophet, but also because by that knowing of him, we become to be acquainted with the Wisdom of God*. Here Mr. Sh. may note that Dr. O. owneth that *Christ is made Wisdom to us by teaching us Wisdom*, that is, (as Mr. Sh. himself expounds it) *by the Doctrines he Preached, and those Revelations he hath made of God's will*. How then doth Dr. O. exclude the Religion of Christ's *Law and Gospel*? or set Acquaintance with his *Person*, in opposition to Acquaintance with his *Gospel*? when you see he takes in both, in that single passage which you first quarrel with? Is this fair play, Sir? would you be so serv'd your self? At that rate a man may find fault with the most sound, and judicious book that ever was written, yea with a book (if there were any such) written by an holy Angel, and sent down from Heaven. But whereas you stumble at those words, *viz. that by the knowing of Christ his Person, we become acquainted with the Wisdom of God*; to me they seem to be of easie, and safe interpretation. For
first,

first, I am perswaded that Christ executeth the Office of a *Prophet*, in revealing to us, not only by his *Word*, but also by his *Spirit*, the will of God for our Salvation. Now you seem to be of opinion that Christ revealeth his will to us only by his *Word* (For if by his *Spirit* also, doubtless Acquaintance with the Person of Christ by procuring us a greater effusion of his spirit might increase our spiritual wisdom.) I know another Gentleman of your opinion (if that be it) he, and his followers, viz. *Socinus Solut. scrup. Respons. 6. Sacra Scriptura ita aperta, atque expedita sunt, ut nemo eas qui non intelligat plane stupidus non videatur. Also Simon Episcopus, Disp. 46. priv. coral. 1. An ulla operatione Spiritus sancti sine ullo alio medio opus sit, in voluntate, aut intellectu, aut in Scripturis promittatur, ad hoc ut quis credat, verbo externo proposito? Nos Negativam tuebimur.* In plain *English*, the Tenet of the *Socinians* you know is, that God, and his will, may easily be known by meer reading of the Scripture, without any illumination from the Holy Ghost. You seem to be of the same mind, for that you reproach *Dr. Owen* for mentioning any other way whereby we may come acquainted with the Wisdom of God than by the Revelations which he hath made of his will in the Scripture. If that be true, why doth Christ say, *John 14. 26. The Holy Ghost whom the Father will send in my name shall teach you all things.* We expect not that the Spirit of God should reveal those things to us, which are no where revealed in the Scriptures: but that he should make us know

those things more for our good, that he should help us to understand what otherwise we should not : therefore *David* saith, *Psal.* 119. 18. *Open thou mine eyes that I may see wonderful things out of thy Law.* *John* 16. 13. *When the Spirit of Truth is come, he will guide you into all Truth : for he shall not speak of himself (viz. any new Truths that Christ had not himself delivered) but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak.* v. 14. *He shall receive of mine, and shall shew it to you.* And as the Spirit of God explaineth, so likewise he applyeth Truths to our hearts, which we our selves could not apply. *He witnesseth with our Spirits that we are the Children of God, and cryeth in us, Abba Father, and maketh us to know the things that are freely given us of God.*

But to come yet more close, why should Mr. Sh. make so strange of this, that by knowing of the Person of Christ we should become more acquainted with the Wisdom of God ? Is not *Col.* 2. 3. pertinently quoted by Dr. Owen to confirm it, viz. *For in him dwell all the Treasures of wisdom and knowledge ?* Let Mr. Sh. disprove if he can, that those words do most directly refer to the Person of Christ. I have elsewhere shewed great probability for it. Now, to be acquainted with him in whom are all the Treasures of wisdom, is sure one good way to be wise. Especially considering that it is his Office as Prophet of the Church to teach us, and *his Lips are to preserve knowledge*, and he is appointed of God to be to us wisdom, &c. But moreover the very Person of Christ is a most excellent Glass, in which

which to behold the wisdom, and all other the Attributes of God the Father, sith Christ is *the express Image of his Father's Person, and the brightness of his glory*. Did not Christ say to Philip, John 14. 9. *He that hath seen me hath seen the Father, and how sayest thou then, shew us the Father?* That Text is also greatly to our purpose, 2 Cor. 4. 6. *God hath shined in our hearts to give the Light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the Face of Jesus Christ*. Let Mr Sh. deny then if he can, that knowing of Christ, is the way to more acquaintance with the Wisdom of God, &c.

The other passage in Dr. Owen's Book, Of Communion, p. 92. is this, *Those properties of God (his pardoning Mercy, &c.) Christ hath revealed in his Doctrine in that revelation which he had made of God and his Will, but the Life of this knowledge lies in Acquaintance with his Person, wherein the express Image, and beams of this glory of his Father doth shine forth*. That is, that these things, are clearly, eminently, and savingly to be discover'd in Jesus Christ. I say, this is that other passage of Dr. Owen's, upon which Mr. Sh. builds his Accusation, that Dr. Owen rejecteth the Religion of Christ his Law and Gospel, and betaketh himself only to the Religion of Christ's Person, and to Acquaintance with his Person. But how injuriously, he that runs may read; for Dr. Owen's words are, that *The Properties (or Attributes) of God Christ hath revealed in his Doctrine, in that Revelation which he hath made of God and his Will (that is, in the Holy*

Holy Scriptures) How then doth Dr. Owen reject Acquaintance with the Gospel of Christ? Indeed he saith, that *the Life of this knowledge lyes in Acquaintance with his Person, or that they are eminently, clearly, and savingly to be discovered in Jesus Christ.* What Acquaintance with Christ is in Dr. Owen's Divinity, Mr. Sb. tells us, p. 38. viz. *a knowledge what Christ is, hath done, and suffered for us; moreover, an Experimental knowledge of these things* it is that Mr. Sh. saith, Dr. Owen, and such as he, pretend unto, p. 139. Now as Mr. Sb. hath explained him, I think Dr. Owen hath said very well, for what will it profit any man to have the *Letter* of the Scripture at his fingers ends, all by heart, as they say, yea, a competent knowledge of the sense and meaning thereof, if he have not that which St. Paul did profess himself to thirst after, *Phil. 3. v. 10.* viz. *that he might know Christ, and the power of his Resurrection, and the Fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable to his death.* Surely the Life of knowledge is so to know Christ as to believe in him, to love, delight, trust in, obey, and study to please him, above all others, to know the power of his Death, and Resurrection, &c. and that is the knowledge Dr. Owen speaketh of, and who dare, in exprefs terms, contradict that assertion? Upon the whole matter I find Mr. Sb. had as little reason to quarrel Dr. Owen for what he hath written touching this matter as those two Brothers, of whom *Camerarius* speaketh in his *Hora subcisiua*, had to quarrel, and kill

kill one another, which was but this. Walking out together in a brave Star-light night, one of them, who was a *Graſier*, wiſht that all the Firmament were one Rich Meadow, and his: the other being a *Butcher*, wiſht that all the Stars in the Sky were ſo many large Oxen. The Graſier replied, what would you do with your Oxen? Said the Butcher, I would put them into your Meadow; but you ſhould not Brother, ſaid the Graſier; yea, Brother, but I would, ſaid the Butcher; and ſo they quarrelled (ſaith my Author) till they kill'd one another. I ſay, Mr. Sh. in reference to what Dr. Owen hath ſaid about our acquaintance with the Perſon of Chriſt, had no more cauſe to quarrel him, than the Graſier had his Brother the Butcher, for ſaying if all the Stars were Oxen he would put them in his Meadow (if all the Sky were that) and the other him for ſaying he ſhould not. I wiſh Mr. Sh. to conſider, that as the *Fall* of Man came in at firſt by means of affecting undue knowledge, viz. *to be like God, knowing good and Evil*. So Man's Recovery is appointed to be by means of that knowledge which is proper for him, according to that of our Saviour, *John 17. 3. This is Life Eternal, to know thee, and Jeſus Chriſt, whom thou haſt ſent*. Let him therefore take heed how he derides that kind of knowledge which alone is ſaving.

Let him alſo remember, that at that great day every body that can make the leaſt pretence thereunto, will lay claim to Acquaintance with Jeſus Chriſt (which he hath ſo much expoſed) and

and that it had been better for any man never to have been born, than when he shall knock at Heaven Gate, to be answered, For what Acquaintance knock you here? *Depart, I know you not.* In that day the *Acquaintances of Jesus Christ*, will appear to be the only happy persons: and I dare say himself will wish, if he continue to despise them (as such) that he had rather cast in his lot amongst them. God grant that I may be ignorant of all things else, rather than of Jesus Christ, and him Crucified: For St. *Paul determined to know* (that is to make known) nothing else but that amongst the *Corinthians*, 2 Cor. 2. 2. I shall conclude this Chapter with those words of the great Apostle, *Phil. 3. 8. Yea doubtless, and I count all things but loss for the excellencies of the knowledg of Jesus Christ, my Lord: for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but dung that I may win Christ.*

FINIS.

ERRATA.

Reader, For the Reason rendered at the end of my Prodomus, I shall leave it to thy self candidly to correct the Typographical Errours, advertizing thee but of two: viz. In p. 205. l. 12. for manifold, read manifest. and in p. 209. l. 12. be sure in stead of Man, to read God-man.